Sixth Series, Vol. XXX No. 25

Monday, August 16, 1982
Sravana 25, 1904 (Saka)

LOK SABHA DEBATES

(Ninth Session)

4(7) 3
6 12 82

(Vol. XXX contains Nos. 11 to 20)

LOK SABHA SECRETARIAT
NEW DELHI

Price : Rs. 4 00

CONTENTS

No 25—*Monday, August* 16, 1982/*Sravana* 25, 1904 (*Saka*)

	Columns
Papers laid on the Table	2—3
Messages from Rajya Sabha	3—4
Assent to Bills	4—5
Motion of No-confidence in Council of Ministers	5—250
Shri H. N. Bahuguna	5—23
Shri Vidya Charan Shukla	24—30
Shri Samar Mukherjee	30—41
Shri V. N. Gadgil	41—49
Shri Frank Anthony	49—57
Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee	57—66
Shri H. K. L. Bhagat	74—85
Dr. Subramaniam Swamy	85—93
Shri Maganbhai Barot	93—100
Shri Tridib Chaudhuri	100—101
Shri Charan Singh	101—115
Shri Yashwantrao Chavan	116—121
Shri Indrajit Gupta	121—133
Shri Pranab Mukherjee	133—145
Shri C. T. Dhandapani	145—152
Shri R. S. Sparrow	152—157
Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan	157—163
Shri R. Venkataraman	163—169
Shri Chitta Basu	169—173
Shri Chandra Shekhar Singh	173—180

	Columns
Shri Chandrajit Yadav	180—84
Shri P. Shiv Shankar	184—93
Shri Ram Vilas Paswan	193—203
Shri Kusuma Krishna Murthy	203—206
Shrimati Indira Gandhi	206—221
Shri H. N. Bahuguna	222—233

LOK SABHA

Monday, August 16, 1982/Sravana 23, 1904 (Saka)

The Lok Sabha met at Eleven of the Clock

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

DR. SUBRAMANIAH SWAMY: (Bombay North East): No confidence is against the Government and not against you, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: I thought that you will only move a vote of confidence.

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : (हिसार): अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैंने नियम 222 के अन्तर्गत आपको लिखकर दिया है कि राष्ट्रीय ध्वज पर एक आदमी की खोपड़ी और एक औरत की खोपड़ी लटकाई हुई है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : मैं बाद में देखूंगा।

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : यह राष्ट्रीय ध्वज के अपमान का प्रश्न है।

श्री जयपाल सिंह कश्यप : अकेला अध्यक्ष महोदय, . . .

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कश्यप जी, आप पहले रूल्स को पढ़ लिया करो। ये रूल्स आपने बनाये हैं। इनके अनुसार आप काम किया करो तो अच्छे लगोगे।

श्री जयपाल सिंह कश्यप : मैंने नियम के अनुसार ही किया है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : नहीं किया है। एक दिन में दो क्वैश्चन नहीं हो सकते हैं।

(व्यवधान)

श्री मनोराम बागड़ी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, यह राष्ट्रीय ध्वज के अपमान का प्रश्न है।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप दूसरे ढंग से लाइये, ऐसे नहीं आएगा।

11.02 hrs.

PAPERS LAID ON THE TABLE

REVIEW ON AND REPORT OF NATIONAL SMALL INDUSTRIES CORPORATION, LTD., NEW DELHI FOR 1980-81.

THE MINISTER OF INDUSTRY AND STEEL AND MINES (SHRI NARAYAN DATT TIWARI): I beg to lay on the Table:

(1) A copy each of the following papers (Hindi and English versions) under sub-section (1) of section 619A of the Companies Act, 1956:—

(i) Statement regarding Review by the Government on the working of the National Small Industries Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1980-81.

(ii) Annual Report of the National Small Industries Corporation Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1980-81 along with the Audited Accounts and the comments of the Comptroller and Auditor General thereon.

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in

[Shri Narayan Datt tiwari]

laying the papers mentioned at (1) above.

[*Placed in Library. See* No. LT-4504/82].

REVIEW AND ANNUAL REPORT OF NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL COOPERATIVE MARKETING FEDERATION OF INDIA, LTD. NEW DLEHI, FOR 1980-81

THE DEPUTY MINISTER IN THE MINISTRIES OF AGRICULTURE AND RURAL DEVELOPMENT (KUMARI KAMLA KUMARI): I beg to lay on the Table:

(i) A copy of the Annual Report (Hindi and English versions) of the National Agricultural Cooperative Marketing Federation of India Limited, New Delhi, for the year 1980-81 along with Accounts and the Audit Report thereon.

(ii) A copy of the Review (Hindi and English versions) by the Government on the working of the National Agricultural Cooperative Marketing Federation of India Limited. New Delhi, for the year 1980-81.

(2) A statement (Hindi and English versions) showing reasons for delay in laying the papers mentioned at (1) above.

[*placed in Library. See* No. LT-4505/82)

11.03 hrs.

MESSAGES FROM RAJYA SABHA

SECRETARY: Sir, I have to report the following messages recieved from the Secretary-General of Rajya Sabha:—

(i) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 11th August, 1982, agreed without any amendment to the Industrial Disputes (Amendment) Bill, 1982, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 9th August, 1982."

(ii) "In accordance with the provisions of rule 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 11th August, 1982, agreed without any amendment to the Motor Vehicles (Amendment) Bill, 1982, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 10th August, 1982".

(iii) "In accordance with the Provisions of rules 127 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to inform the Lok Sabha that the Rajya Sabha, at its sitting held on the 11th August, 1982, agreed without any amendment to the Iron Ore Mines and Manganese Ore Mines Labour Welfare Fund (Amendment) Bill, 1982, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th August, 1982".

(iv) "In accordance with the Provisions of sub-rule (6) of rule 186 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in the Rajya Sabha, I am directed to return herewith the Iron Ore Mines & Manganese Ore Mines Labour Welfare Cess (Amendment) Bill, 1982, which was passed by the Lok Sabha at its sitting held on the 7th August, 1982, and transmitted to the Rajya Sabha for its recommendations and to state that this House has no recommendation to make to the Lok Sabha in regard to the said Bill".

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी (हिसार) : सचिव महोदय को हिन्दी में बोलना चाहिए।

11.05 hrs.

ASSENT TO BILLS

SECRETARY: Sir, I lay on the Table following three Bills passed by the Houses of Parliament during the current session and assented to since a report was last

made to the House on the 13th August, 1982:—

(1) The Estate Duty (Amendment) Bill, 1982.

(2) The Appropriation (Railways) No. 3 Bill, 1982.

(3) The Appropriation (No. 3) Bill,, 1982.

11.06 hrs.

MOTION OF NO-CONFIDENCE IN COUNCIL OF MINISTERS

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Hemwati Nanddan Bahuguna.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order please.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER: (Delhi Sadar): Is it necessary to have confidence (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKEAR: What are you doing?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I would like to appeal to all the Members to take note of the fact that we shall be sitting from 11 A.M. to 7 P.M. when the final reply will be given by the Prime Minister. By that time I shall try to regulate....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE (Rajapur): She will intervene.

MR. SPEAKER: Sorry. She will intervene. I have to regulate for those eight hours. The maximum number of hon. Members may take part and accordingly I think...

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : (नई दिल्ली) : उधर से ज्यादा लोगों की बोलने की जरूरत नहीं है।

MR. SPEAKER: Shri Bahuguna, I shall allow you half an hour.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA (Garhwal): One hour. I beg to move:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Minsters".

I am obliged to my friends of the opposition for giving me this opportunity to present this vote of No-Confidence against a Government which represents no one......(*Interruptions*).

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आपको अपनी बात कहने का हक है और उनको अपनी बात कहने का हक है। Everything has its limit. Member should have his say.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKEAR: Why do you not listen and reply when your turn comes?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Those who have ..(*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI PRATAP BHANU SHARMA (Vidisha): He said that this Government does not represent anybody. Certainly it represents the feelings of the people of this country. How has he used these words? We object to this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I correct myself by saying that they represent monopoly capitalists, they represent all the exploiters, they represent all that is bad and all that is the antithesis of the ethos of the freedom struggle. If they are happy to represent all that, I have no quarrel with them. The mere fact of being in majority in this House does not mean that you represent the people. If this Government really represented the people, would it need draconian laws like ESMA? Would it require the law to be amended to curb freedom of press? Need the Government and the party in the State be told to follow course of nominated bodies that that is neither democratic nor consistent with the ethos of our freedom struggle". I have no personal animus in the matter. When I say that the ruling party has equated itself with the nation and the nation with one individual, that is the greatest tragedy that has befallen our great institutions including this Lok Sabha or the Parliament. (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Why are you speaking? Why are you interrupting?

आपको कौन रोक रहा है? जब आपकी बारी आयेगी तब कह दीजिएगा।

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I know their difficulty because they cannot face facts. The trouble with the ruling party today is that it has lost its own controls. In the States there are petty power based quarrels in the ruling party. These are eating into the very vitals of the whole social and economic progress of various States. In the Government of India nothing functions except the Prime Minister's House and that has been proved time and again even on the floor of the House. Therefore, one of the Ministers said and if I remember correctly it was Information Minister who said "in our party thought apparatus functions only at one point i.e. the point of leader. Rest have merely to follow" In such a situation one can very well realise that in a country of our size, the country which has problems—linguistic, religious, ethnic and that of uneven development that we have had during the last 35 years, it has resulted in a situation wherein the sovereignty and integrity of the country is under stresses and challenges—a thing about which the Prime Minister speaking from the ramparts of the Red Fort yesterday talked. She has been talking times out of number with regard to the maintenance or need for maintaining the integrity and unity of this country. If you look into the whole picture of the Nation, how does it look like? The North East is in flames But has the Prime Minister gone there except once for a short while, in person?

Has she gone to Manipur? The whole north-eastern region is in flame. But has there been a solution to those problems? If and when some one asks about some questions, has the Government stated what the position has been since the partition took place? Has there been a white paper stating various developments that have taken place with regard to the question—the unfortunate question—which lingers on, the issue with regard to the infiltrators in Assam? Has the Government stated their position with regard to the various facts that the Government of India have had with the Government of Erstwhile East Pakistan and subsequently Bangladesh, with regard to the various people who have come into Assam as they have come in some other parts of the country?

But the fact is that this Government has taken a Mona Lisa stance with regard to the Assam situation. The Government does not want to say the truth; the Government does not want to come out with facts. The Government wants to keep everybody on tenter-hooks and they want to say nothing which displeases according to them, this or that section of the people. In fact, there are various factors regarding the North Eastern region as such—that is not merely a question of infiltrators. Let us look at the development plans for the North Eastern region. Let us look at the way, simple thing, like banking system which is operating in the whole area, or for that matter, the whole country and you will realise that there is uneven economic development and draining of resources from that area—financial and physical resources from that area—to the areas outside. That has caused all the distortions, all the troubles that we are facing. The whole North Eastern Region is facing problems—not only the North Eastern region but also in areas like Santhal Parganas and Chhota Nagpur, in areas like Konkan, in areas like nothern parts of Uttar Pradesh, parts of Bihar and parts of Madhya Pradesh, etc. This uneven development, this type of draining of resources from one area to another and being the whole development on the basis of colonial relationship, as if one area is the colony of another area, is creating problems. The developed areas treat the hinter-land as their colony for exploitation. All this has resulted in a very awful situation for the nation. And, therefore, the Prime Minister calls to the Opposition, calls to the nation for unity and integrity. I think, she would better look at the things which she has in her charge—that is, making those people, those areas self-reliant and self-sufficient. Instead of reading the new 20-point programme, read the Congress Party's Resolution which was adopted way back in 1947 in Delhi, when the Congress decided to go

in a certain fashion with regard to the future development of this country. That was the United Congress, the Congress in which all the participants of the freedom struggle were present. The All India Congress Committee which met in Delhi on the 17th November, 1947 has adopted a resolution. I would not read out the whole, Sir, because time bars me from reading out the whole Resolution. But they constituted a committee for working out a concrete programme of development, economic development. The Committee consisted of Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Abul Kalam Azad, Jaya Prakash Narayan, Prof. N. G. Ranga. I am happy, Prof. Ranga is here—the only survivor of this great tradition, yet on the wrong side. Mr. Gulzari Lal Nanda Shri Kumrappa, Achyut Patwardhan, he is out for some reasons; Shri Shankar Rao Deo, who is also no more in this world—they constituted the committee.

Now, Sir, all this lays down what is to be done with regard to this type of things and stopping this type of economic exploitation of one area by another area, of one class of people by another class of people, what is to be done in the agrarian sector, what is to be done on the industrial front etc. The 20-point programme of Emergency and the new 20-point programme of post-80 period has hardly anything new about it—has hardly anything of substance of radical nature in it. This 20-Point programme is not even a good paraphrasing of this Resolution. It is not a new direction or perception which is tried to be achieved. This Resolution was unanimously accepted and the report of the Committee so constituted was subsequently accepted unanimously by the All India Congress Committee in 1948. The resolution has to be resurrected.

Sir, the Prime Minister is very very desirous that the Opposition should play some constructive role. She is very much upset that the Opposition has still some place, is still finding some place in the newspapers. Yesterday, her speech from the ramparts of the Red Fort, appeared to us as if the entire news dissemination and the views carried by the media is a total monopoly of the Ruling Party. Has the Opposition no place in her scheme of things?

Now, I make a bold offer and, I am sure, my friends of the Opposition will agree with me. If the Prime Minister is serious about land reforms, and I know what it cost me to go ahead with land reforms in Uttar Pradesh as the Chief Minister. I am making a bold offer again—I am sure. I am sharing the views of my friends on the Opposition—if the Prime Minister and her party are keen to have land reforms, let us set the Records of Right in the State of Bihar let us all pool our resources; let us all put our cadres together, to create a correct Record of Right in Bihar which successive Governments owing allegience to the ruling party have so far failed to achieve. Let us take two districts; let us go to Purnea and Samastipur, or any one district she likes. If she wants any one district in Uttar Pradesh, let us go there, to any area, any place. We are willing to go with them. Let, us see where is the vested interest located and where the shoe pinches? Let us know in which party the feudal interests are powerful. Let us know who represents them. That is why pointing to the Ruling party I said, "You do not represent the people; you represent the feudal lords who are in umpteen number in power and position, manning Prime Minister whole party today. It is not that you are interested in carrying out the tradition of the Congress by which you swear time and again".

Now, may I say one thing more? What, is the strategy of development? The whole planning strategy is based on fiscal planning. I would request the hon. Prime Minister, through you, Sir, to go into the records of 1974 National Development Council in which I have had the privilege to represent as the Chief Minister of Uttar Pradesh. My speech is there. I had plainly said even on that day that if the Government of the day follows the strategy of development as contained in these Plans, India will continue to remain a permanent member of the beggars' club. I am sorry to say that the present trip of Mrs. Indira Gandhi to America in which she talked about India's poverty and India's need for softy aid, continues to look as if we

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna]

are members or shall continue to be permanent members of the beggars' club. What have we achieved all these 35 years? Which section of the people gained in these 35 years and what? What we have achieved is that the number of people below the poverty line have progressively increased. They are 74 per cent today. And no wonder they are so because our policy is directed to help and assist the 'haves' and not the 'have-nots'.

Let us look at the rate of taxation and measures of taxation. The whole thing is so significant that the Government taxes, in 1951, accounted for 1|10th of revenue. Today, they are 1|4th. Where is the revenue coming from? Who is paying this money and from where is the money coming? (*Interruptions*) Garhwal has been your Waterloo; you will remember Garhwal all your life.

Today, indirect taxes account for 9|10th of the revenue of this Government. Whom do indirect taxes hit? Against whom are they directed? So far as direct taxes are concerned, in the corporate sector, I can prove from the Reserve Bank of India studies that though the corporate tax rates are from 55 to 65 per cent in relation to our monopoly houses, multinationals and so on. But a study of 279 houses indicate that in no one year have they paid more than 40 per cent of the tax rate applicable to them. Now the aggregate has come to 40 per cent. What does this mean? How is this happening? It has happened like this that there are companies which are paying bonus, shares and dividend. There are companies who are paying bonus shares but are not paying income-tax and they are not one. They have increased in number. TELCO has not paid a rupee as income-tax during the last so many years and I can quote chapter and verse to prove how the big houses, nonopoly houses, and again multinationals have cheated you left and right.

There have been their sights of foreign money and my Hon. friend, the Hon. Industries Minister went all the way to Switzerland to discuss about the inflow of foreign money. But what is the contribution till date? From 1956 to 1976, the total contribution of foreign multi-nationals' investible capital has been 5.2 per cent of the total capital investment in India. What have they brought to India? Except drain India of all resources, cheat India loot India,—has been their approach to the whole question?

Therefore, this Government is still wandering through the jungle which it has created for itself and is not able to find the way out.

We are third in scientific manpower, as claimed, and yet we are the third lowest from the bottom in terms of our per capita income. I am not a votary for GNP and per capita income as correct indicators of progress of Nation. For, GNP and per capita income have ceased to be regarded as the correct indicators of the progress of the nation even in capitalised system. But really it means "what is the total people that have gained by it". On that score, I would like to say that unless this Government changes, its strategy of planning and makes our manpower availability and our resources position in terms of land, of minerals, infra-structure built, the heavy industries built and it it is prepared to do planning on that particular basis, the whole approach and the whole progress would have a different direction altogther which will benefit the millions and millions of people who live in the countryside, who live below the poverty line today and it is these people whom, I said, this Government does not represent and don't they constitute the majority of the country's population?

Now the Government is talking that they should like to have the cooperation of Opposition. Has the content and nature of this cooperation been defined till date? What are the directions in which this particular type of cooperation is sought to be had? To say yes for everything or to argue or to listen? Is there some method? That has not been defined.

I hope when the Prime Minister rises to speak or intervene, she will be able to say what type of cooperation she seeks

from the Opposition and what type of co-opeartion she expects the Opposition to give her.

We have been saying that democracy is in peril in this country. Be it the question of institutions like Lok Sabha, this scant courtesy shown to it by the Prime Minister, if you calculate the hours she sits in this Parliament and calculate the hours that Shri Jawaharlal Nehru sat in Parliament, you will find the respect she holds for the methods of her father and for the methods of parliamentary systems obviously. She has no interest in the parliament or Lok Sabha, as such.

Similarly, the judiciary is being browbeaten. Threats are being held out on transfers. Strange things are happening. Hindi speaking man is sent to Tamilnadu area. And Tamilnadu area man is being sent to Hindi-speaking area. How will they understand the records of the case? What can they really do about it? Judiciary is being pulverised and an effort is being made to stuff now the Supreme Court Judges. Otherwise, the large number of vacancies that are lying there would not have been left unfilled. This obviously means that democracy is being slowly eroded, institutions which are protectors of democracy are also being weakened or stuffed by partymen.

I remember the Prime Minister was deeply concerned about demoralisation of officers when she was in the Opposition, and she talked about it. I must admit very frankly and say, 'Yes in some cases it did happen; one or two acts did make it look as if it would be demoralising the official machinery with regard to their approach against officers'. But what has she done ever since she came to power? Officers promoted out-of-turn were given a send-off, an unceremonious send-off, even without their knowing half an hour before they were asked to quit and go. what has she done? Changing people from one place to another has been the pastime in which she has been indulging. This Government has been indulging more in demoralising the administrative apparatus, to make it toe its line, make it work for it as if it was a party apparatus, rather than do anything about it. Therefore, I think, the administrative apparatus, which is another limb of democracy, has thus been weakened to an extent awfully not recognisable.

Then, the Press Bill, Look at the Press Bill that has come up in Bihar. I was surprised and I was thinking myself in my own moments of quietness as to what had happened to the Prime Minister. I remember, when there was the Hindi agitation in down south, she was a Minister in the Cabinet of Shri Lal Bahadur Shastri, and in spite of the advice tendered to her by people, she went to Tamil Nadu. Tamil Nadu was really burning in flames. What has happened to her? In Bihar something happens and she is not bothered. In Arunachal something happens and she is not bothered. The Chief Minister. Bihar, brings a Bill. And what are the contents of that Bill? He was asked by the Press Guild people. 'Did you have examples to find out, did you sort out the cases, why you need such a Bill'. He said, 'No'. Then they asked him, 'Why do you want this Bill?'. He said, 'Because I want it'. And why does he want it? He wants to close the eyes and ears of the press, so that they will neither hear nor listen nor see, and if at all see, only what the Government wants them to see, through the "Braile system" of political manoeuvre. This is exactly how the press has been blinded. From Bhagalpur to press, it is a long process of blinding. She has not only kept silent but let democracy slowly lose its vitality and slowly lose its capability. And she still remains quiet. This Bill makes offences non-bailable, this Bill authorises cognizable offences being instituted by executive magistrates. This is something strange that has happened, and the Prime Minister has kept silent. At best my hon. friend, Mr. Vasant Sathe, assures us that, under article 19 of the Constitution, freedom of the press is provided and that this Government will take care to do that. I congratulate him for his still remembering this Constitutional clause which, if looked at in relation to their practical way, appears to have been forgotten by them. These are issues of national importance, these are issues which will govern even our future generations. What do we want to do with these curbs on freedom of press? But the Prime Minister has kept silent about it and she has not bothered about it.

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna]

There is the question of unemployment: I am very happy that this debate is taking place in the month of August, a month of re-dedication, a month in which we re-dedicate ourselves to the service of the nation, a month which reminds us of the brave patriots who laid down their lives to bring this day for us. From the ramparts of the Red Fort, what did the Prime Minister say yesterday? She talked about unemployment. But what is the position of unemployment in 1981 from 1956? Progressively from a small number of 7.59 lakhs, they have reached 163 lakhs of unemployed. What does it mean? What has she succeeded in? Let them say by majority that they have succeeded in everything, including increasing unemployment. I will also raise my hand and say, 'Yes, you have done so', if they want to have confidence on that score of their failure to solve the problem of unemployment, I have nothing to say. The Sixth Five-Year Plan goes further and says, that at some point of time in the year there are 2.1 crores of people who are seeking employment. If she would like to have the reference, she can look into the Sixth Plan and find out for herself. Why is this happening? It is because capital-intensive industries are being put up even in areas where small industries could have taken their place. Lever Brothers will be allowed soap. Colgate-Palmolive will be allowed tooth paste and my hon. friend will bring in changes in the Industrial Policy forgetting all about what Jawaharlal said in 1948. Jawaharlal's name, Gandhiji's name, Subhash Babu's name are being taken. Subhash Babu talked of socialism in Tokyo University. He talked of public sector in Tokyo university when he was unfurling the flag of India's independence outside this country. Jawaharlal talked about it. Sardar Patel and everybody was a party and privy to it. Our hon. and most revered friend, Mr. Ranga was a party to that and let Mr. Ranga himself put his hand on his conscience and say how far they have gone ahead in this direction.

Why is this happening? Because labour-intensive areas are being given up. Sir, it is not even half an hour since I started.

Sir, they have been given all sorts of relief and there are more than 30 companies in this country which are prosperous companies but they have not paid a single paise as tax because they have been given all types of reliefs and the result is that small scale industries have been squeezed. Now, this industrial policy which they have set is going to ultimately kill the small scale industry because Tatas, Lever Brotheres, Birlas and so on will go on adding their capacities as they like and then certainly, things are not going to be in favour of the small scale industry. All I would like to say is that they are talking about price control and they said, 'We have controlled the prices'. I do not want to say anything on prices. The price line is there and anyone can see for himself. Whereas in January 1980 the consumer price index was 371, in May 1982 it became 452. The rise from April 1981 to June 1981 was 1.3 per cent. From April 1982 to June 1982 it was 4.7 percent and from January 1982 to July 82 it was 27.4 percent. If they are happy with these figures and if they are happy with the fact that tomato is selling in the Bazar at Rs. 8 to 10 a kg. and if they are happy with the fact that the producer is not getting even Rs. 2 a kilo, I have nothing to say. The producer is not getting anything from vegetables, he is not getting even 25 percent of what is being charged and the middleman comes in the way and Prof. Ranga had put in that committee recommendations along with Kumarappa and Jawaharlal the elimination of middleman in all these sectors so that the producer may not be looted at the one end and the consumer may not be looted at the other end, but the merry story goes on and the Government happily says that the prices are under control.

Now threats are being extended to traders? Why these threats? I can tell you what the threats are. Raids were carried out by the Income tax Department—in thousands but how many prosecutions? Only 3. This is how they are trying to threaten people. Raids will be there but the prosecution will not be there because something will happen in between and everything will be over.

Then sugar quota release. Did it have any effect on the prices? Everybody can see it. I am sorry to say the Agriculture Minister has nothing to say about it.

Now in Delhi prices have gone up so high. I am willing to make one offer. I am willing to go along with the Food Minister to-day to any fair price shop in Delhi and let us find out what type of wheat is being sold. If 50 per cent of wheat that is being sold in the fair price shops is not dust and dirt, I am willing to apologise to this House and I am willing to say that things are not correct so far as I am concerned. Sir, I have made personal inquiries.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: That is not true.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am not yielding. I accept the challenge. What happens? The hard fact is that the poor become poorer. Quickly I will go through it because for each rupee spent by the Government of India, the poorman's share is not even 16 per cent. The people below the povertyline will not even get that. Who gets most of it? Out of the expenditure of the Central Government, 83.4 per cent goes to the benefit of the rich while the benefit that goes to the poor people is 16.6 per cent. This is the actual calculation of the budget.

Now, Sir, on corruption, I do not want to say more than what has been said in the House. The worst of it is that corruption has become not only a phenomenon inside the country. (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: What about you?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am willing to be prosecuted. Why can't the Prime Minister prosecute me if I am corrupt?

I make an offer to the Madam Prime Minister, to institute a case of corruption against me? She is welcome to institute a case against me and I am ready to face it. (*Interruptions*). Sir, my young friend reminds me by mentioning the name of Jayaprakash Narain.

SHRI HARISH RAWAT: (Almora): What your Mr. Raj Narain said about you in 1974?

1974 में राजनारायण जी ने जयप्रकाश जी की मीटिंग में नारा लगाया कि—

जब से आया बहुगुणा,
भ्रष्टाचार बढ़ा सोगुना

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Mr. Jayaprakash Narain said 'Don't take my name quite often.' He must be saying the same thing to him also. The point is that in a public meeting in Lucknow, Shri Jayaprakash Narain said that 'I am not going to have a movement against Bahuguna's Government.' So, I do not want to have a certificate better than that.

So, far as land reforms are concerned (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please (*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Won't you behave? You will have your chance.

In a Sample Survey of 26th November, the estimated surplus land was 18 million acres. What does the Government say?

MR. SPEAKER: Please wind up.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Let me have my say. Of the 18 million acres, they have taken over 3.89 million acres. Madam Prime Minister had been the Prime Minister earlier also from 1966 to 1977. We have had a number of meetings on that score—land distribution to the poor.

Nothing has happened on this. Only 1.79 million acres of land have so far been distributed. On the question of industries and banks, I want to say something. Whatever they have done is to help no one other than the monopoly houses. The only good thing that they have done is that they have suggested that they will have a monitoring cell now for watching the performance of licences issued under IDRA. The Dutt Committee recommend-

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna].

ed this way back in 1969. As far as capacities are concerned, the Industrial Development and Regulation Act has been violated. The capacities have been raised by hundred to 150 times by the multi-nationals and in one case, they have raised the capacity by 1300 times of that allotted to them. In the balance-sheet some of them say that they were not called upon even to have themselves registered under any of the laws—not even under the Industrial Development and Regulation Act. What about the bank credits? (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: Order please.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: They are too afraid of facts. I am merely presenting the facts. Of the total bank credits, 93 per cent of the borrowers borrowed 10,000 while one borrower of the three borrowed more than Rs. 10 lakhs and they cornered 60 per cent of the bank credit. Is this going to pave the way to socialism? In all 3,244 borrowers, the amounts outstanding to their credit are more than one crore rupees each and the total amount was Rs. 6,995.49 crores. If that is so, then look at the other things. The amount drained through the banks. This Government talks about the State Governments that they will not be allowed the overdrafts. Hon. Finance Minister oftentimes threatened that 'I am not going to allow the overdrafts to the States.' What do we do? In the banking system, the money drains out from the weaker areas to the stronger areas. I can prove that from the facts given by the Reserve Bank of India's study. Even in the States like West Bengal and U.P. the net outflow has been Rs. 1,353.83 crores in the case of Uttar Pradesh and 1,318 in the case of West Bengal. If you are going to have people's money and deposits totally controlled by you and if the States do not have anything to fall back upon and if even in a capitalist country like America if you can have a City Bank, and Unit Bank and regional bank and let that bank prosper and invest in that area why do you not re-think of the whole banking structure? Why not think about it so that no area is dranied to the advantage of another area. (*Interruptions*).

So far as the public sector finance is concerned I would only like to say that in investments like the LIC the private sector gets 96.8 per cent and public sector merely 3.2 per cent of its investible funds.

Sir, self-reliance is a big word and I remember from her speech—to my mind a very bad day when she was expelled from this House—when she spoke from this place and she said that she was bothered about self-reliance because BHEL was being starved of all its orders. I am willing to give in writing the whole thesis and willing to prove that even after the Seventh and Eight Plans under your new policy of collaboration with Siemens and the new policy which you have followed in the wake of Rajaadhyaksha recommendations even if you give all the orders to BHEL connected with capacities to be created in the 7th and 8th Plans the BHEL will be working to its 50 per cent capacity. Not only this, their research... (*Interruptions*)

Anyway it is a question of facts. If you want facts I am willing to discuss with the hon. Minister for Energy. Let him not get upset about it. Sir, so far as research and development in BHEL is concerned it is being scuttled and with 'Siemens' this term has been so miserable and so bad that now even a small item like condenser and a type of control system or anything now you cannot have in India. You will have to purchase from them more and the total import content of BHEL has already reached more the tune of 69 per cent in terms of raw-materials only. Is this going to be self-reliance? Is this the way out for self-reliance?

What about Tarapur, Sir. The Prime Minister had said the other day that we are at liberty to process the spent fuel "as and when we like." We do not agree with America's interpretation placed on it. All right. Then I hope today it is a fine day. It is a fine month; it is a great month and, I hope, we will listen from the Prime Minister that having built re-processing facilities in consultation with America under Treaty obligations of 1963 she will

order re-processing of the fuel from tomorrow, not if necessary but to do our bit in order to get our self-reliance in this critical area. If she does not do it that only means though she says it is self-reliance but acts otherwise. In recent Tarapur agreement they have achieved nothing, I am sorry to say in Tarapur they have more than surrendered.

MR. SPEAKER: You have taken more than 40 minutes. You have to conclude...

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I have talked only for forty minutes...

MR. SPEAKER: I have to distribute the time.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I agree but I asked you the other day that I would require an hour. Give me fifteen minutes more.

MR. SPEAKER: No. No. I told you forty minutes and I am going to stick to it.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Sir, 1963 cooperation agreement was all right so far as it goes but then the Soviet and the French were offering us enriched uranium while America was dilly-dallying. But we refused to have it from them. Sir, I don't have the time to go into it but we told them that we will not have it from you. (*Interruptions*) Then, Sir, we had the privilege of hearing from the hon. Foreign Minister about the recent view. What happened suddenly? There was a consultative committee meeting and in that consultative committee meeting the Prime Minister introduced a new factor in the Tarapur business and slowly she said decision regarding Tarapur will have to keep in mind the overall interest of our national interest and relations with America and the total overall impact of the Treaty and so on of the Tarapur business and so on.

Now, Sir, it was done at a point of time when according to a report and a paper read in Chicago, of which I will read a little bit here, the U.S. experts are almost in a position of yielding to our point of view....

MR. SPEAKER: Bahuguna ji, please keep in mind our agreement.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: The agreement was that you said, even one hour.

MR. SPEAKER: No, I never go back on my word. I said, I will give you 40 minutes and I am giving it.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am speaking about Tarapore. These interruptions have cut into my time. Please keep it in mind.

MR. SPEAKER: I have everything in mind I want to give chance to everybody.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Regarding Tarapore, Mr. Warren Christopher, the U.S. Deputy Secretary of State said this in the Senate hearings in June, 1980. I quote:—

> "If we disapprove these shipments India is very likely to consider itself free of its obligations under the 1963 agreement. In that event, India might reprocess the U.S.-origin fuel in India and use the plutonium in Tarapur reactors.. If we disapprove these shipments, India might also withdraw from the safeguards agreement and might decide to disregard our veto over any other material already supplied beyond its use as fuel for Tarapur..On the other hand, turning to the positive side, if these shipments are approved, we will, at a minimum, have preserved India's obligations under the existing agreements for another year or two."

In effect, what they are saying was, let us agree to these shipments. When the other side was relenting, we also started bending backwards to appease the Americans because of the new philosophy which was enunciated in America by the son of the Prime Minister that the public sector is infra-structure for private sector, a thesis totally inconsistent from the view held by Indian National Congress party 1929 to 1969. in those 40 years, never before had the Congress accepted that position.

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna].

Now, Sir, finally I would like to ask certain questions on Tarapore. And the questions are these—

What about the delivery schedule of the enriched uranium agreed upon with the French?

Are they going to adhere to any delivery schedule or not? Will the U.S. undertake fresh commitments that the spares required for Tarapur, would be always available, and in time? Now, Sir, has it ihas been stated by Prime Minister in unamiguous terms that India will have the right to process the spent fuel the way it likes? And finally, will they also ensure that as a result of the new negotiations, new agreements, no other additional burden will be placed on Indian facilities such as the pursuit-clause, etc?

AN HON. MEMBER: Harijan atrocities.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Now, Sir, I come to Harijan atrocities and communal riots. So far as Harijan atrocities are concerned 31,000 and more harijan atrocities have taken place in the period of one year. And this Government claims to be a defender of the weaker sections. I have moved my No-Confidence Motion which must be accepted in the overall interest of the nation.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Shri V. C. Shukla.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: The Prime Minister in her Election Manifesto has claimed that she will put down communal riots. I request her to reply when she replies to the debate how many officers were transferred, how many were punished due to communal riots. I therefore request the House to accept the No-Confidence Motion which I have already moved, namely:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Minister."

MR. SPEAKER: Motion moved:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers.".

MR. V. C. SHUKLA:

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): Has he gained confidence, Sir.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: (Mahasamund): Mr. Speaker, Sir, when the session of the Lok Sabha is convened you have now made it a regular practice to invite the leaders of the opposition groups to come to you and also the Prime Minister to talk about various matters that agitate the minds of the opposition and other matters which are considered important. You would remember, the matters that were referred to during this discussion have almost all been discussed during this session of Parliament, and it is not only very strange, but it also reflects upon the attitude of the opposition, how after having discussed all these things, towards the fag-end of the session, they chose to bring this motion of no-confidence in the Council of Ministers, not with any particular purpose, but just to say something which they have already said many times in the House and in order to try to embarrass you and the Government.... (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: How?

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY (Midnapore): Are you embarrassed, Sir?.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: What are you trying to do?

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: We have shown the utmost accommodation and respect to Parliament by agreeing to extent the sitting of the House which was going to conclude last Friday.... (*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: What are you trying to do and prove? Let him speak.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: This is not something new; they have been doing that; they did so once more also when the Prime Minister was abroad.

Now, I will come to another question that Shri Bahuguna raised. He is a very comical manner raised the question—whom do we represent? And he does not know that. Along with Shrimati Indira Gandhi in 1980 he should be on the top of his voice—*Indira lao, desh bachao.*

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Oh, no, no.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Shri Bahuguna was a Congress candidate in Garhwal, and he was must vociferous not only in Garhwal, but in various parts of the country where he went. He would begin his speech with *Indira lao, desh bachao,* and end by saying that the country can be saved only by Congress(I) rule and by nothing else. He was rightly believed because he was speaking from his personal experience. He had been a minister in the preceding Government, he knew from inside what havoc they had played, what kind of corruption, and what kind of destruction to public life they had caused during their regime, of which Shri Bahuguna was a part. Therefore we spoke.

"इंदिरा को लाकर देश को बचाना है"

everybody thought, that he was speaking the truth, and in fact, he was speaking the truth. Now, if he wants to change his stand, that is understandable. He said these things only about two years ago, not very far off. By talking of Shrimati Indira Gandhi, what is the majority that he got in Garhwal elections at that time? It was almost 1.30 lakh. It was when he contested in Garhwal as the Congress(I) candidate. Now, when he contested against the Congress(I), his majority has been reduced to a paltry figure of 29,000 votes. It was regarded as his own constituency.... (*Interruptions*). I would say that this majority of 29,000 votes that he got was on account of his Congress(I) past and not because of his murky present. He has had no association with country's service. He has been a servant of Congress(I), an ordinary soldier and leader of Congress(I) in U.P., but for this he would not have probably got this much votes. And he must not forget that this difference has come after two years of our rule, when he should have actually exceeded the margin he got in 1980. But he knows how and in what manner he managed to get even this majority.

Shri Bahuguna is a climber, That we all know. Panditji is sitting here. He knows how he climbed over him. Sir, we all know how he tried to climb over his colleagues in Janata Party. Choudhuri Sahib was sitting here, I don't know why he has gone away.

AN HON. MEMBER: He has got disappointed with Bahuguna's speech.

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: Sir, I would like to say what Choudhury Sahib wrote to the then Prime Minister, Shri Morarji Desai, just about three years ago in August 1979. I hope you will permit me to read these because these are public documents and have been placed on the table of the House and that they have also been printed widely.

In his letter, Shri Charan Singh, the then Home Minister of India, writing to the then Prime Minister of India in official D.O. says, and I quote:

> "Shri Bahuguna got two scurrilous pamphlets published in Lucknow, painting me in the darkest possible colours one of which I had brought to your notice as long ago as in March 1977."

Sir, this is all indicating how Shri Bahuguna manages to plan and the kind of methods he employs in doing such things.

Again, Sir, he says:

> "It is at Shri Bahuguna's instance that a campaign for removal of Chief Minister of UP has been engineered and kept alive almost since the day he was elected to this office."

He was referring to Ram Naresh Yadav.

[Shri Vidya Charan Shukla]

Sir, the later part may not be true, because he was speaking from his personal knowledge, but first part he wrote as the Home Minister of India. He based his observation on the official report and official documents he had in his possession.

Sir, again Mr. Bahuguna had cheeks to talk about corruption. I would like to say what the Home Minister of the country had to say about corruption of Shri Bahuguna. Sir, he says:

"As far as allegations of corruption against Shri Bahuguna, I will refer here only to some of them. According to a report submitted to the former PM on 25-11-1975, Shri Bahuguna had received substantial financial advantages in cases relating to (i) disposal of power station at Harduaganj (Aligarh) to the Modis; (ii) disposal of two power units to Lakshmi Rattan Cotton Mills, Kanpur, and (iii) favour to Swadeshi Cotton Mills, Kanpur, owned by the Jaipurias.

'The Modis were principal financiers of Shri Bahuguna and they were shown undue favours in the form of lesser octroi duty, purchase of shares and appointment of Shri K. N. Modi as Chairman of the Provincial Investment Industrial Corporation. There were several other industrial houses who contributed to the funds of Shri Bahuguna.'

12 hrs.

Now he is saying that we represent these industrial houses! Actually Mr. Charan Singh as the Home Minister said that he represented them. (*Interruptions*) Again, Mr. Charan Singh continues, and I quote—

"There were several other industrial houses who contributed to the funds of Shri Bahuguna. His son Vijay Bahuguna, a young advocate, aged 28 years, was appointed a retainer by several big companies. These charges came to your notice formally four months ago, but to no avail'.

This is what Shri Charan Singh regretted. (*Interruptions*). Shri Charan Singh continues, "On January 15, 1978, Shri Shibban Lal Saxena, a Member of Parliament elected on CFD ticket, wrote to you a longer letter detailing 101 instances of Shri Bahuguna's misconduct or corruption. A copy each of this letter was endorsed to me and Shri Jagjivan Ram also. Shri Saxena concluded his letter with the following words:

'I have given in the above pages the result of long and painstaking inquiry over four months. I believe the facts I have narrated to be true. The findings have shocked him. I am amazed that a man of this character who is an incarnation of Satan himself......'

(*Interruptions*)

....Satan himself and whom people call Natwarlal, should be a member of the Cabinet of the Government of India.' I have therefore thought it my duty to bring the aforesaid facts to your notice for a thorough inquiry by the CBI."

(*Interruptions*)

Now, we have to find out—rather we do not have to find out—because they are quite obvious: they are on record. Now it is for Mr. Bahuguna to refute these charges if these charges are not true. Then, either Chowdhary Sahib must come forward and say that whatever he had said was false, or he should say that whatever he said was misquoted or something to that effect. But these charges stand and these charges cannot be refuted by anybody because these charges were made by Shri Charan Singh not in his individual capacity but as the Home Minister of India. Similarly Shibbanlalji made charges as a member of his own Party.

Now, talking of political morality Mr. Bahuguna has changed six parties in five Years. It is on record. (*Interruptions*). If you contradict me I will be very happy I will count them. In 1975-76 he was in Congress. That is number one. Then, he went to CFD with Babu Jagjivan Ram. Then he went to Janata. After Janata he went back to Lok Dal combined with Shri Charan Singh and became the Finance Minister. That is the fourth. Fifth, he came back to Congress (I). Sixth, he

went out and he is the leader of the DSP. (*Interruptions*). Theseare the facts. A person, who can change from one Party to another six times in five years, must surely be an expert climber. (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: A great chamaleon!

SHRI V. C. SHUKLA: He was talking about our respect to Parliament. He was part of the which ruled this country without facing the Parliament for five months. On the day when Mr. Bahuguna as Finance Minister of the country was supposed to sit in Parliament and face the Lok Sabha they resigned and ran away. They just had no guts or courage to face Parliament. How can they talk about the respect of Parliament, etc.? If they had any respect for Parliament, they would have faced Parliament, put their case before Lok Sabha and if Lok Sabha had passed the motion of no-confidence against them they could have resigned. But it was really something which showed that these gentlemen, who were, at that time, ruling the country, had just no respect for Parliament.

About the judiciary also to which Mr. Bahuguna made a reference, I know about the judiciary a little bit because I had several cases going on against me all over the country. And I can say that least two High Court Judges had been promoted on my account. One was Mr. O. N. Vohra, who was promoted after convicting me and late Shri Sanjay Gandhi for two years. Similarly, another District and Sessions Judge at Raipur was elevated to the High Court after he gave the desired report about me to the then Janata Government. We know by various other things and the judges' case that had been decided by the Supreme Court after long deliberations, how this party or various people sitting in the opposition now, treated the judiciary when they were in power.

About the people whom we represent, Mr. Bahuguna knows it well, because he was a part of our party for long years, that apart from the people in general we, in particular, represent bulk of the minorities, Scheduled Castes and Scheduled Tribes and people who live below the poverty line. They are our vote bank and this has remained unchanged over the years. Today if somebody wants to say that we represent the monopoly houses, etc. Mr. Shibban Lal Sakseha's and Mr. Charan Singh's observations about Mr. Bahuguna prove the point that it is not we who represent them but some of the Members sitting in the opposition, who represent these monopoly houses.

In this matter, there are again several instances which I can quote as to how Mr. Bahuguna had sung the praise of the performance of Mrs. Indira Gandhi and the Congress Party. Now I heard him saying, with great amusement, that in 35 years we have done nothing. We have done so much that the country today is respected and regarded and as one of the foremost leading countries in the world. By making such observations you cannot reduce the respect of this country which it has enjoyed in the comity of nations.

There are lot of things which I would like to say. But here I want to repeat one thing that Mr. Bahuguna must realise that he cannot fool the people for ever. He can fool them for some time but not for ever. He should now realise that by repeating these worn-out slogans, he can neither entice the people nor get their sympathy. So, I request him to see the light of the day and withdraw his Motion of No Confidence.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE (Howrah): It has been said that this type of no-confidence motion has become a ritual, because the issues that we are going to discuss here have already been discussed in the House. So, I want to remind you that last time when we discussed the no-confidence motion, the main issue which came to the forefront was regarding corrupt practices indulged in by the Chief Minister of Maharashtra, Mr. Antulay. At that time, the Prime Minister virtually kept silent. Now when we are discussing this no-confidence motion, what is the position of Mr. Antulay? So, Shri Antulay rose to power by the grace of the Prime Minister and became a symbol of

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]
the fountainhead of corruption..(*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT (Ahmedabad): Sir, on a point of order. The matter is sub judice...(*Interruptions*).

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: There is no point of order; nothing of that sort... (*Interruptions*). I have mentioned Shri Antulay. What is his position now, as compared to the top position which he occupied? So, the criticisms, the corruption charges which we brought here, have been vindicated by the court and the Governor has allowed proceedings to be brought against him. He has also been removed from that position.

It is not a ritual. We are continuing our struggle against corruption. We want to focus the real feelings of the masses outside. That is why people's criticism outside often find reflected inside. This fight will go on and will produce results, if not tomorrow, day after tomorrow. That is why we criticise your policies and performances....(*Interruptions*).

Shri Shukla has mentioned so many things about our friend, Shri Bahuguna. I remember, I read in the papers, there was a proposal to take Shri Bahuguna into your party, and that the Prime Minister herself, her daughter-in-law, her grand children, all came to Shri Bahuguna's house........(*Interruptions*). She will reply to whether he was to be taken into your party...(*Interruptions*). I think Shri Bahuguna has got experience regarding your party while inside and has come out with bitter experience. That is why he has become a bitter fighter against you....(*Interruptions*). Yes, more people will come out of your party with bitter experience and they will join our ranks in the fight against you...(*Interruptions*).

I thank Shri Bahuguna for he did not follow the Aya Rams and Gaya Rams. He showed his integrity by resigning his parliamentary seat and taking it up as a challenge. In that way, he has respected the parliamentary norms.

Why were you so much afraid of holding the Garhwal elections? It is only when your appeal in the Supreme Court in the matter of West Bengal was defeated that the Election Commission announced 19th May as the date for the bye-elections, when you were forced to announce the elections in Garhwal. The people of Garhwal accepted the challenge and have given their verdict against you democratic methods.

(*Interruptions*)

I am not concerned with whether personally he is honest or dishonest, because there are so many people inside your party, Shri Antulay and others, who are dishonest. Those issues have been discussed.

Before this No-confidence Motion there is another issue of Kuo deal. What is this deal? It is Kuo oil deal.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT: Sir a criminal complaint has been filed in the court of law. So, anything discussed in Parliament and out of Parliament about this deal is not proper. It is a matter which is *sub-judice* and no Member can refer to it under Rule 352 of the Rules of Procedure. I want to bring this to the notice of the House. Please....

(*Interruptions*).

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I am not talking about it.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Sir, we are going to discuss it. You kindly give your ruling on this point because I am going to refer to the deal in my speech.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SAMAR MUKHRERJEE: What is in the court of law?

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What is in the court of law? The case of missing file is not in the court of law.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: Please sit down. There is nothing. You are talking unnecessary things. What is there in it? Please sit down.

(Interruptions).

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Sir, I want to refer to the mysterious disappearance of the file from one of the Special Secretaries of the Prime Minister and the Prime Minister is silent. Sir, these are the indications about where the country is now sinking. I want to draw the attention of the entire House to this. Since the last No-confidence Motion till today what is the overall situation of the country as a whole? On that, I want to draw your attention as to whether we are advancing or we are progressing.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: That is why I am coming to that point. You are progressing. But what are the progresses? Sir, This World Bank Report has come out stating that after 35 years of our Independence, our country lists third from below as the lowest income group. After 35 years of Independence we are the poorest country up till now. Even after 35 years of Independence, you are talking about removing poverty, you are talking about removal of unemployment. But all figures show that poverty is increasing, unemployment is increasing and prices are increasing and the cost of living is increasing day by day. Certainly it is a progress and you can claim credit for this that you have become..

(Interruptions).

MR. SPEAKER: Please let him speak.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: If this does not rouse you or if this does not put you into self-criticism as to why this is happening, God help you! It is logical that the day will come like 1977 when these very people will throw you out and that is the fear which you are now being faced with. That is why you have started attacking on the very foundations of parliamentary democracy. From this by.—election of 19th May, you take the over all position. Has your position advanced?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Very good. You have become a minority in Haryana. You were in majority. Is this advancement?

AN HON. MEMBER: By money.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Now we saw in paper that one M.L.A. was purchased for Rs. 20 lakhs. Is this a parliamentary norm? You are advancing from 38 to...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: One went by a drainage pipe.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: This is the standard that you have now brought into this country. From 38 you have become 56 now. This is Aya Ram and Gaya

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE (Jadavpur): What is the rate now?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I read in the paper Rs. 20 lakhs. That may increase. This is the credit you can claim! But whom are you purchasing? You are purchasing those who revolted against you Those who revolted against you are being put in the Ministry and those who remained loyal to you, they have been thrown out. That is why you are giving premium to those who revolted. By giving premium to the rebels your party cannot last. *(Interruptions)*.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Merceneries are mercenaries.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: What is happening? Now I take up the Press Bill of Bihar. We are criticising here but the masses are in action. Why is this Press Bill? It is because corruption has become so rampant. They want to prevent leakage of news regarding corruption in the press. Despite all the precautions some news of corruption are coming. So, that upset the Chief Minister of Bihar and he brought the Bill—the black draconian Bill against which not only the press men are now in action..*(Interruptions)*. I read in

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

the newspaper. I have brought the paper also wherein I saw .

श्री नगीना राय (गोपालगंज) : बंगाल में क्या हो रहा है ?

श्री सत्यसाधन चक्रवर्ती : आप जैसे पापी लोग वहां नहीं जा सकते ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : क्या हो रहा है । जब आपकी तरफ़ से कोई बोलेगा तो वह बताएगा, आप क्यों बोल रहे हैं बिना वजह ।

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Have some decency. Anti-Press Bill is now being opposed by even Bihar Secretariat Officers Association. The Bill has been brought not only against the Pressmen but against those who secretly divulge any deed of corruption and then we will be put into jail for five years. That is why we want to oppose this draconian Bill of corruption.

I want to request you to give a serious thought that the country is degenerating into corruption to such an extent that the Chief Ministers are also now becoming an object of criticism not only in the press but also in the public. I read in the press also. Twenty two M.Ps. of Maharashtra have sent a Memorandum. They have given it to the press that the present Chief Minister of Maharashtra is so much involved in corruption and the administration is so inefficient. These are not my words. These are the words of twenty two M.Ps of Maharashtra that has come in the press. (*Interruptions*). Moopanar is your leader Moopanar General Secretary, is your leader. If you do not want to learn, you remain as you are.

THE MINISTER OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING (SHRI VASANT SATHE): No one has made charge of corruption.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I have brought the paper. I have no time. Otherwise I could have read it out. Then, I read in the newspaper that one Congress Minister in Andhra Pradesh—present Minister—has brought an open charge against Shri Anjiah. This is all newspaper report. (*Interruptions*). It is regarding cement scandal. Shri Anjiah just told the Press, "I am deciding to retire from politics because my partyman has brought an open charge against me". I want to request them to look into these charges.

Your policy is leading the country to disaster. (*Interruptions*). Don't take away my time. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please, sit down. Don't waste the time of the House.

SHRI ANANTHA RAMULU MALLU (Nagarkurnool): He is not a Member of this House. (*Interruptions*).

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: One after another, the Congress (I) Chief Ministers have to go in this fashion.

Now, I come to the economic situation. Last time, I remember, the Prime Minister in her reply, claimed the inflation has been contained and the wholesale price has started going down. Where lies the claim now? During this month—this is yesterday's paper of Economic Times, which says:

> "The official wholesale price index for all commodities for the week ended July 31 registered a rise of 0.4 per cent at 291.9 against 290.7 for the previous week. The index for food articles group moved up by 1.5 per cent to 256.9 from 253.1. . . ."

This is wholesale price. I am not talking of retail price. Last time also, you have admitted that even the decline in wholesale price has no connection with the consumer price.

The consumer price has increased to such a phenomenon that this requires an unrelenting price squeeze. It was also published day before yesterday and on 12-8-1982. (*Interruptions*) The price of tomatoes in July was Rs. 10|- per k.g. which is almost double the price of mangoes and all these things. The consumers' price index is increasing very seriously in an alarming proportion. Then

the real earnings of the workers have been eroded very seriously.

Now, during the 35 years of your rule after independence, though you talk of socialism, you talk of direct principles of the Constitution, where it is categorically stated that the policy of the Government should be pursued in such a way so that every one gets the right to work and it can be achieved — the disparity of income can be reduced but what is your policy? The monopolies and the big-houses have earned huge profits during the last 35 years.

The other day you brought one Bill for the amendment of the M.R.T.P. Act. For what purpose? It is for giving more concessions to the monopoly houses and to liberalise further restrictions. In that context, Shri Somnath Chatterjee, gave quotations from the Sachar Committee report over the period since the Act was passed. Over the period, the Government has authorised liberalisation of procedure in certain types of cases in the public interest according to the provisions of the rules.

> "Out of 618 effective applications received by the Central Government from 1st June, 1970 to the 31st December, 1977, under certain Sections, only 59 cases were referred by the Government to the Commission."

You want to give protection to all big houses, monopoly houses. How much have their assets been increased? How bigger have they become? I am reading from Mr. Somnath Chatterjee's speech:

> "The latest figures for top 20 business houses which are registered under the MRTP Act show that the assests have hisen from Rs. 2,430 crores in 1969 to Rs. 4,465 crores."

Whether these are facts or not, this is how you are bringing about reduction of disparity by allowing monopoly houses to amass huge profits. Further, I quote:

> "The percentage of increase of assets between 1970 and 1975 is 68.6. The assets of the first two large industrial houses of this group of 20 have risen to Rs. 1,760 crores which works out roughly to 40 per cent of the total assets."

There are other figures, he says, which will show the results further. The figures are that the Tatas' assets have risen from Rs. 10.46 crores in 1937 to Rs. 981.77 crores in 1976 and the Birlas' assets have risen from Rs. 1.79 crores in 1937 to Rs. 974.63 crores in 1976.

Whom are you serving?

AN HON. MEMBER: What about West Bengal?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: This is your reply. You are serving the monopoly houses. Whenever faced with this question, you ask, what about West Bengal? West Bengal is not a soverign country. It is one of the States of India. West Bengal's economy is functioning within the framework of the economic policies pursued by the Central Government.

The real income of the workers is going down. That is why this disparity, day by day, is growing. The more you remain in power, the more this disparity is bound to increase; the more you remain in power, the more prices will go on rising and the more you come up with repressive measures, repressive Bills, to suppress the working class, when the cost of living index is rising when you have adopted the policy of wage freeze, they have no other alternative but to wage a struggle at least to maintain their existing standard of living and that is why they are now forced to go into action.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why are you so excited?

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: I am not excited. I want to impress upon you so that some good sense prevails. These are the facts.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: We want to incite you.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: The Union Labour Minister, in reply, on 27th

[Shri Samar Mukherjee]

April, 1982, in the meeting of the Consultative Committee of MPs attached to his ministry, gave the following figures regarding the workers' wage the index No. of real wages:

	(Base — Rs. 100)
1967	91
1968	94
1969	101
1970	101
1971	101
1972	103
1973	92
1974	71
1975	69
1976	75

These are all not during the Janata raj. This is under your regime, real age of the workers. This is an un palatable thing. This is the reality. What is the way out for the workers today? To change this condition, what have they to do? Because you are bringing ESMA. You have now brought National Security Act.

Now you have introduced Industrial Disputes (Amendment), Bill, to declare strikes illegal, to illegalise all agitations and movements. That is why this policy of total repression is thought of to establish authoritarian rule. The ESMA was discussed here. The whole night we opposed. The Government was so much adamant. They did not listen.

Evem before the Industrial disputes Bill came, we suggested that Labour Minister should consult the Central Trade Unions before bringing the Bill. But they refused. This is the attitude. So, you have taken the policy of confrontation and challenge and your attitude towards the workers is quite clear and evident.

Regarding this Bombay Textile Workers strike, it is more than seven months now. Today is 211th day. And they have been forced to continue the strike and now they have decided to start Jail Bharo Movement.

They have declared productivity year but what is their point? They want to impose INTUC over the workers which the workers have totally rejected. But what is happening in Bombay today? I can declare here that this will happen in all industries.

(*Interruptions*)

These are the symptoms that you must read on the wall.

Now the country is passing through recession because you have accepted this conditionalities of the IMF. Now you have fulfilled their conditionalities in such a way that the World Bank is very glad. They have given a very good certificate! Before the first agreement was signed, they put pressure that unless the Government removes the obstacles, they will not give money. But, after fulfilling those conditionalities now the World Bank is very much satisfied and that is why, they have now given another Rs. 1,800|- crores to this Government. But they have imposed further conditions where they have restricted further credit, and they have squeezed further credit and our Finance Minister has written to them that in January again "we will discuss." What will you discuss? You will discuss about our Budget. This World Bank, this IMF, wants to influence our Budget through that discussion, through that review. This is a shame. This is a surrender of our economic sovereignty to this World Bank and IMF.

I have no time. Otherwise, I would have explained what conditionalities have created havoc in our economy.

You have liberalised imports when our factories are now closed.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr Gadgil.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: One minute.

I can give some figures of sick industries of our economy which is going

sick Incidence of industrial sickness I have given. You must know where you are leading the country and what will be the effect.

> "The incidence of industrial sickness has been widespread, also in medium units not only the small."

> "The number of medium scale units at the end of June, 1980 was 1,026 against 1,040 in 1979. The outstanding bank credit was 219. Data available shows that at the end of June, 1980, the number of sick small-scale units was 22,325 as against 20,326 units at the end of June, 1979."

I do not want to read. This is how the whole economy is in doldrums. Recession has started. Stocks are piling. Factories are being closed. Workers are being victimised. On the other hand, you are raising prices, the railway fare, the postal charges, then the coal price, then diesel and petrol prices, and all this under the dictation of the IMF and for the satisfaction of the monopoly houses. So, serving of the monopoly houses is bound to create more poverty and more unemployment . That is why, from the top if there is no remedy, all these millions and millions of people will come into the streets unitedly and change your licies and ultimately oust you from .ne government.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL (Pune): Sir, this motion has to be understood in the context of the Mover, the motive and the manoeuvre. About the Mover Mr. V. C. Shukla has said sufficiently. I will only say this: if he thinks that he is a great hero of Garhwal, he should know that it was only with our support that he won last time with 1,30,000 votes and now he has won with the support of all other Opposition parties, including the Bharatiya Janata Party, whose help the great secularist Mr. Bahuguna took; with all that and with all the money. You are a Sanskrit scholar, Sir. There is a saying:

सर्वगुण कांच :म् ग्र श्रंते

Al money goes to 'Guna', and he is not only 'Guna' but 'Bahuguna'. So, you can imagine.

About his changing parties. I will not say anything except that he has changed six times, and he has changed political parties with greater frequency than the Hollywood actresses had changed their husbands.

What is the political credibility of Mr. Bahuguna? I am surprised that all the opposition parties have made him their spokesman. That shows their political credibility.

Much is being talked about corruption. Mr Bahuguna was a member of the Janata Cabinet and that Cabinet consisted of at least three members against whom Commissions of Inquiry had passed strictures.

Not very long ago. an agitation was started in Gujarat against the Chief Minister on the allegation that he was corrupt. The Nav Nirman Movement started and it led to the J.P. movement; the whole history, you know. Now what do we find? The same Mr Chiman Bhai is ceremoniously admitted in the Janata Party the other day, and a Maharashtra leader of the Janata Party says, "Well, the Janata Party is like the Ganges; it purifies". If it be so, I suggest that we may abolish all prisons and jails, do away with the Indian Penal Code and the Criminal Procedure Code and send all such people to the company of Dr. Subramaniam Swamy....

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North-East): I accept

SHRI V. N. GADGIL: What is surprising is this. A Janata Cabinet Minister of those days now says in an interview to a foreign newspaper:

> "..The Janata Party came to power as a result of youth and student agitation against corruption in Bihar and Gujarat which later snowballed into a bigger movement. We failed in making corruption an issues. The Janata Government did not carry on a campaign against corrupt officials and politicians but in fact promoted many of them."

[Shri V. N. Gadgil]

Another astonishing thing he says is:

"Corruption has ceased to be an issue and is now accepted as a fact of life."

Who has said this? The great fighter, Mr. George Fernandes, in an interview to a New York newspaper 'India Abroad'. This is the state of corruption.

I remember, during the Janata time we raised the question — not only Mr. Bahuguna was there, but Prof. Madhu Dandavate was also there — about Mr. Kanti Desai. What were we told? We were told that 'the allegations are routine, all Kintu — that was the expression used—the allegations are niradhar, baseless'. It was also said, You are all chidranveshi, you only pick up holes; and therefore, no Commission will be appointed'. When in 1971 I entered this august building, I found on one of the walls of this House inscribed the great Indian invocation:

सर्वे सुखिन: सन्तु, सर्वे सन्तु निरामय:
सर्वे भद्राणि पश्यन्तु, मा क्वचित
दुखमाप्नुयान
ओम शांति शांति शांति ।

In the Janata regime it became:

सर्वे रुठिन: किन्तु:
सव किन्तु निराधार
सर्वे किन्तु निराधार:
सर्वे छिद्राणि पश्यन्तु
मा कमिशनाप्नुयान
ओम कांति: कांति: कांति: !

This was the record of the Janata regime.... (*Interruptions*) I will deal with you. Don't worry.

Now, Mr. Samar Mukherjee talked about achievements. I will not compensate lack of logic by raising my voice. I will only say with facts and figures as to what are the achievements. The Great Soviet Union which has nearly three times the land of India and half the population of India, after 60 years of socialist revolution is not self-sufficient in food.....

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Poor knowledge.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL: It is on record. What about the other super power? This is what Daniel Patrick Moynihan writes in the New York Times:

"We are in the worst recession since the 1930's. Nearly 10 per cent of our workforce and 30 per cent of our industrial capacity are idle. Real interest rates and federal deficits have reach their highest levels in history. Dun and Bradstreet reports the highest number of business failures in a single week since 1932."

Look at the record of the socalled advanced nations and super powers, the USSR and the USA and see our record. I have no time to give all the statistics. But you will find that compared to 1980-81, in the year — 1981-82, coal production increased by 9.6 per cent, power generation by 10.2 per cent, and industrial production increased by 8 per cent over the previous year. Same is the situation in petroleum and various other industries. But the most remarkable achievement, although it has been ridic ed there, is in the case of prices. Pr rise which was very high during the Janata regime is now brought almost to zero in April.... (*Interruptions*) Of course, there is a slight increase recently but it is a temporary phenomenon. Mr. Dandavate must know the difference between a seasonal rise and secular rise. This is the seasonal rise which you find every year in any country. Therefore, in the field of economics, these are our achievements.

This motion I welcome from another point of view. This also gives us an opportunity to assess their performance. What is their performance? What is the credibility of the Opposition? The largest Party was the Lok Dal. Now it has split.....

AN HON. MEMBER: Parlok Dal.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL: I am told Lok Dal (T). I have heard it said about air hostesses — tea or coffee or me? Now soon we may have Lok Dal (T), Lok Dal (Coffee), and Lok Dal (me). Me will of course be Mr Charan Singh! This is the state of Lok Dal. A new Lok Dal is born — I am told by the newspapers that they have appointed a committee to draw up the constitution and Mr. George Fernandes is busy drafting the constitution. I am sure that when he is drafting the constitution. Mr. Madhu Limaye must be busy with the plan how to split the Party as soon as the constitution is ready. This is the Lok Dal.

What about the BJP — Mr Vajpayee's party? I must confess this is my favourite party, because no other party gives so much amusement, entertainment and humour in public life as the BJP. Since my childhood, because I come from a city which is supposed to be the heartland of the RSS and I live in that area in Pune and I live in an area where my house is the only Congressman's house and in that RSS desert mine is the only oasis. What is their performance? Even in the school I was told in Pune that the strength of Shakas in Nagpur is 1 per cent of the population and when I went to Nagpur they said that the strength in Pune is 2 per cent. Same thing continues now. When I went to Himachal Pradesh, I was told that compared to Delhi the BJP is stronger in Himachal Pradesh.

I went and found that tremendous resources were pouring in for the trucks, tractors, posters etc. Shri Vajpayee visited that place several times. What is the achievement? Our seats in Assmbly increased from 7 to 31 while their increase was from 25 to 29. This is supposed to be a great achievement, a great national alternative!

Then, look at Kerala. Out of 68 to 70 seats contested, 62 lost their deposits. This is their achievement. Of course, they were contributing to the finance of the Government of India! What happened afterward? Mr. Vajpayee said in a press conference that they have achieved a great thing because they got more than 3,000 votes on average we get 3000 votes in the Poona Municipal Corporation elections. This great national alternative got an average of 3,000 votes. This is supposed to be a great national alternative! As I said the BJP provides entertainments BJP is ABVP. What does ABVP mean? I do not mean Akhil Bharatiya Vidyarthi Parishad. It is Atal Behari Vajpayee's Party. There is nothing else in this party. But, what shall I say about others? Firstly, about the Janata Party, I can only sympathise with any party that has. Dr. Swamy, as its deputy leader. More than this I will not say.

About the CPI and CPM, my friends, from West Bengal and Kerala will better equip themselves with and answer. I will only say this that I won't embrass them and I will not say anything about them because if they have to reply, it will take much more time for them to get instructions and so I will not say anything about them. Mr. Bahuguna thought he made an important constitutional point just now when he said that the Prime Minister does not come to Parliament. He must know that it is so all over the world. I am not quoting from the Book 'The Anatomy of Power' by James Morgach. This is not by a politician. Otherwise, they will be suspicious. This is a book written by a London Political Correspondent of the *London Times*. This is that he says:

"But, latterly premiers perform their Question Time sports twice a week and then quickly disappear behind the Speaker's Chair....

This is the position in England also.

"Time-and-Motion study would come up with the evidence that modern Prime Ministers and the senior Cabinet Ministers devote more time now-a-days to meetings with the two new pillars of the Establishment, the Trade Union Congress and the Confederation of British Industries than they do with the Commons and M.P.s."

[Shri V. N. Gadgil]

Then, it is said (*Interruptions*) They carry on the principle of accountability to the ridiculest extent when they say that the Prime Minister must come and read the statement. How does it make a difference? I do not know. You can still ask a question.

Now, look at the House of Commons. You will be surprised to find this.

"When Mr. James Callaghan was Foreign Secretary, just before he became Prime Minister, an international affairs debote was arranged, the first for over two years. Only a handful of MPs remained in the Chamber to hear him survey the modern world. Of Ambassadors in the Diplomatic Gallery there were none, and of newspapermen and women in the Foreign Press Gallery, there were five."

These are compulsions of modern administration. As such, you cannot carry on the principle of accountability to the ridiculest extent by saying that every time the Prime Minister must come and reply. That is not expected in the modern times.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: Pandit Nehru used to do that.

SHRI V. N. GADGIL: Sir, again, let me tell my Marxist friend that recently, our Prime Minister visited Japan and the United States and it was a great personal triumph of hers. She met the Japanese Prime Minister and he reiterated the position about the IDA. This was her second triumph. Similarly, this was reiterated by Mrs. Thatcher after Mrs. Gandhi met her. With pride and dignity she talked to the American Government and the people with friendliness and firmness. Of course, it has made some of them a little jealous. It is a human weakness. At least some of them are embarrassed. There are some who do not get sleep unless they do two things during the course of a day — one is to praise the American democracy and the second is to accuse Mrs. Gandhi of dynasticism and hereditary politics. The highest in that democracy has now praised the contributions of Nehru family. Naturally, it will embarass them. I sympathise with them in their embarrassment. They talked about the institutions. Who destroyed the institutions in this country? The Shah Commission demoralised the Civil Services. You talk to any IAS Officer and he will tell you openly what was the effect of it. And who politicalised the judiciary? Sir, I have been in this bar for 35 years. Who politicalised issue? Even today, some writ petition against the President's election has been filed by them. What are the allegations made?

They are all political allegations. These are nothing but some kind of propaganda. They themselves politicalised the judiciary. So, it does not lie in the mouth to talk about judiciary.

Sir, the worst thing that they have done is this. That is a very dangerous thing. They have started doing this under the pretext of so-called second Independence. Secret things from the army files are being quoted everyday. I hope Shri Frank Anthony knows this. In the Supreme Court we find writ petitions about the transfers, postings and promotions of officers. If you allow this interference in the army in this fashion, I do not know what will happen to the Army. One of the Members of the Opposition in this House even quoted the noting of the Commander the Chief of the Army Staff on the files. Where will it lead to? Army survives only on secrecy and discipline—call it a blind obedience. If you start tampering with that, how can an army survive? There will be a danger only. That is all I can say.

Finally, I would say this—who is bringing in this No-Confidence Motion and who is supporting this? It has been brought forward by Mr. Bahuguna. I wont say anything about him. But, this is being supported by Mr. Charan Singh who never faced the No-Confidence Motion in this House. Mr. George Fernnandes vigorously opposed. the No-Confidence Motion against the Government but he resigned the next day. These are the people who are supporting this no confidence motion. I

am sorry to say to them that you have lost your political credibility. India is a pulsating, throbbing dynamic, nation. The nation will march ahead even if you bring hundreds of no-confidence motoins before the House, because the people of India have decided that the nation has no alternative to the Congress and the Congress has no alternative to Mrs. Indira Gandhi.

With these words, I conclude.

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Frank Anthony.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY (Nonimated-Anglo Indians): Mr. Speaker Sir, some members from the opposition are questioning me. For many years, for several incarnations, these Opposition members will not approximate to my position.

I rise to oppose this motion of No-confidence.

AN HON. MEMBER: Being in the Opposition.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Being in the opposition yes, and I will tell you why? What is the context of this No-Confidence Motion?

On the one side you see that the ruling party has an overwhelming majority and, on the other side, with all respect, I must say what have we got—splinters, shavings, sub-shavings and with inbuilt capacity for proliferating into further sub-shavings. At the Centre, there is not the remostest possibility of these shavings or sub-shavings coming together even temporarily even temporarily even for the most power-hunger of opportunist motive, to form another Janata abortion. We know the fate of the Janata motley and some of them here were resoponsible for that fate precipitated by throat-cutting back-stabbing and irreconcilable ideological differences have written permanently the requiem of any change of any such motley ever resurrecting itself.

13 hrs.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, what have the latest by-elections shown? In spite of the pretentious statements by some of the so-called leaders of the Janata party, the results have inscribed the virtual disappearance from the electoral scene of the Janata motley. That is what the recent by-elections have shown. Today, Mr. Speaker there is not a single All India Opposition party. I say this with all due respect to my good friend Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee. They are at best regional parties. And I will give them this left-handed compliment that of these regional parties, relatively, the two best organised are the CPI(M) and the BJ. (*Interruption*) I hope my friends will not get angry. The BJP is only a masquerade label for the RSS—Jan Sangh tandem. Both these regional parties represent opposite ends of the political spectrum. Whatever their protestations, one is the totalitarian party of the extreme left and other is the totalitarian party of the extreme right. Fortunacly for the country, Mr. Speaker, there is not the remotest chance of either of these two totalitarian parties ever coming to power at the Centre. (*Interruptions*) If God Forbid; by some quirk or misfortune, either of them comes to power, democracy in any form will completely disappear..

AN HON. MEMBER: No.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: For the Totalitarians of the Left—I say this with all respect to my friend Mr. Samar Mukherjee—democracy is a bourgeois aberration. And, to the Totalitarians of the Right, Democracy is a dirty word. There would be no elections, because.. (*Interruptions*) I am not quoting anyone. These are my own quotes. I have been not a negleble student of politics. (Inter-

(*Interruptions*)

I know, when my friend gets prosecuted for murder, he will seek me out as one of his counsel.

PROF. SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: What fees you will charge. Sir? Let me know what fees you will charge.

MR. SPEAKER: He will not charge you anything.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: There will be no elections, Mr. Speaker, if either of these totalitarian extremes ever came to power at the Centre. They might go through the motions of an election, they would be shamelessly rigged to perpetuate a political monolith.

Then, we have my friends here, who were sensible enough not to go along with the shavings and the sub-shavings. We have the D.M.K. and the A.D.M.K. They are regional parties....

AN HON. MEMBER: What about the other parties?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I am not forgetting all the others. This is my description: The bewildering permutations fact and combinations. running through all the letters of the Alphabet—I don't know them all—J(S), J(J), DS, LDT,—somebody said LDC—you have all the letters of the Alphabet; And, Mr. Speaker, I say it in all seriousness: These sub-shavings epitomise the curse of Indian politics.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Frank Anthony, in this pectrum where do you keep Frank Anthony?

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Rather a unique position. An All India leader, representing an All India community.

(*Interruptions*)

Except for the Prime Minister, I am the only person in this House with an all-India constituency......(*Interruptions*)

As I was saying, the sub-shavings epitomise the curse of Indian politics,, ultra-individualism, and fetish for personal leadership. Some sub-shavings—I have it on good authority—have more leaders than followers—leaders, deputy-leaders, assistant leaders and so on. And all of them speak as if each one is a leader in his own right. Even in the Assembly elections what did you see? There has been some pathetic attempts—I would not say merger,—to have some kind of a common platform. This was attempted by my friend, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee. But even this loose coalition was rejected. Any talk of merger—I would not say that my friend is opposed to commonsense—is not only rank hypocrisy but arrant political self-deception. Now, in this context what is this no-confidence motion without a semblance of a capacity to pass the motion, without the semblance of a semblance of capacity to provide an alternative Government. It is sheer Nihilism run mad, destroy and continue to destroy everything—that is what it is. And in keeping with the nihilistic technique today the spinters, shaving and sub-shavings are prepared to jump on any or every agitational bandgwagon. The only motivation is character assassination, denigration, and try to cripple the Government somehow, unmindful of the fact that in doing so, they not only cripple the economy of the country, you cripple the defence preparedness also.

I give one obtrusive example—Assam. Some people say that it is intransigence; I would say—no. I say, they are avowed secessionists; they have held not only the nation to ransom, they have declared war against the nation. That is how I see these Assam agitators. Deliberately, they have blocked 12 per cent of our total output of oil escalating the tremendous oil bill that we had to meet. Our oil bill today accounts for 40-50 per cent of our inflationary spiral, and I say this with all the respect that there has been —I did not except it of them—ill-concealed support by the BJP to the Assam agitation. What is the reason? I do not wish to point a finger at anybody, but I think, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee and his coadjustors from the RSS feel that when the foreigners are identified, the majority will be Muslims, and so this large majority of Muslims will be driven out of the country. This is in keeping with their avowed anti-Muslim orientation. And the BJP is not only anti-Muslim—that is why I am speaking as I do—their credo is anti-minority. My friends may challenge, me, but I always keep some of the quotations from his second Sarsangchalak, Guru Golwalkar. What

[Shri Frank Anthony]

did he say? It was forthright, not honest. That is what the minorities had to be— wholly subservient to the Hindu nation, claiming nothing, deserving nothing, not even citizenship rights. That is his credo for the minorities. And they expect me to support this no-confidence motion. supported by my friend there.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I withdraw my support to the no-confidence motion and let him support it.

SHRI JAGDISH TYTLER (Delhi Sadar): They are laughing. On this anybody should be ashamed of what he has said.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: That is the reason why they gave their ill- conceived support to the Assam agitation. Now, why did the Marxists support? Their credos also support extremism mostly, but they did not support the Assam agitation largely because so many Bengalis settled in Assam, particularly in Cachar.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: It is ridiculous. What about Punjab? We opposed the extremists in Punjab. Why he charges like this at this old age?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Look at my friend, the most obscure chamcha lamp-post who was referring to me. At least as a Nominated Member, in my own right I have always sat in Opposition and criticised the Government much more ably and castically-Jawaharlal Nehru, Mrs. Gandhi, when I felt they ought to be criticised.

Now, I come to the Janata. I have a lot of affection for my friend, Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. In two and a half years, what happened? The Janata non-Government reduced the whole infrastructure of the nation to an utter shambles! Fortunately for the country, the present Government has been able steadily to rehabilitate that infrastructure. I give some figure: the output of coal reached an all time high—114 million tonnes; power has increased by 17 per cent, production of steel is in a position of glut.

Now, inflation is the easiest instrument with which to beat any Government anywhere in the world. Runaway increases in oil prices gave a savage impetus to inflation not only in this country, but throughout the world, including the most advanced countries. As I said just now, 40 to 50 per cent of our inflation is due to runaway oil prices. I have got the figures here. In 1975-76, our import bill was 900 crores of rupees; in 1981-82 it was over Rs. 5,000 crores. Our oil Bill including the petroleum products has gone up by 600 per cent; 75 per cent of our total foreign exchange earnings have been diverted and these people in Assam have blocked 12 per cent of our total output. It is axiomatic Mr. Speaker that the greatest instrument to contain inflationary monster is production. And what do we see? Every splinter in the opposition is joining hands with the labour anarchists masquerading as trade union leaders.

(*Interruptions*)

I don't know what he is saying. But Mr. Speaker the truth hurts. You see the political anarchists, joined hands with the labour anarchists in condemning the essential Services Act. I supported the Essential Services Act for very good reasons. They condemned it because they want license to be given to the people in the essential services, not only to paralyse these services, but to paralyse the economy, to paralyse our defence.

Sir, I will be concluding just now.

What is the history of India? It has been a history of tribalism. Let us be very frank. As very eminent Indian once said: "Throughout the Indian history there has been a sense of Indianness, but there has never been a sense of Indian nationality. Near the surface, there always was disruptive, secessionist elements of all hues. And today we see the resurgence of tribalism. My friend was talking of the Punjab. We see a resurgence of tribalism not only in the North East, not only in Assam, but more recent-

[Shri Frank Anthony]

ly, regrettably in the Punjab. We get this varient of tribalism, this linguistic-cum-regional chauvinism.

Alone in this House I opposed the re-distribution of the States on a linguistic base. I foretold and the Statesman said that what I foretold would re-echoe down the corridors of Indian history here! I foretold, once you synonymise linguism with political power, you would get what we are seeing today, linguistic-cum-regional chauvinisms. And we see the manifestations in Kashmir, Tamil Nadu, Karnataka, Maharashtra and so on. They are near the surface.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mahatma Gandhi stood for linguism. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: May be so. (*Interruptions*)

Geographically we are not a country, we are not even a sub-continent, we are a continent! And yet, in keeping with this attitude of Nihilism, we see this attack on the National Security Act: Why did I support the National Security Act? Ask my friend, as I told him, Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayee that if he were ever arrested, to come to me. I did 14 cases under MISA during the Emergency and in every case I got relief. (*Interruptions*) Fourteen cases and in every case the detention order was struck down.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: MISA was summarily misused!

You were taking money for MISA cases.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: I was one of the framers of the Constitution. Deliberately we put in the preventive power. and we senctified preventive detention in Chapter III, the Fundamental Rights Chapter with great reluctance because we felt that it was a necessary evil in order to fight the greater evil of disintegration that lies below the surface. That is why we have the National Security Act in order to maintain the security, the integrity of the Country. But my friends did not agree. As I said, to owing this attitude of Nihilism they do not mind if the country is irretrievably fractured.

Now I have one grievance and let me state that grievance and I will sit down. I am glad. The Prime Minister is here. (*Interruptions*). There is one real grievance against the Government. You are Controlling the wholesale price index but the consumer price index keeps getting out of hand.

There are seasonal fluctuations. But why should it consume price index go out of hand? Why, in Delhi, day in and day out for no reason at all the essential commodities, vegetables, meat, bread, why do the prices keep on rising. I will tell you. *Interruptions*) Because you have these congenital blood suckers, profiteers, black marketeers, and who are they? As I said before, largely they are the constituents of Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee! (*Interruptions*) Why do you not control them? You did it during the emergency. This was one of the boons of the Emergency. India was acclaimed during the Emergency as an exemplar, for fighting or to stem the inflation and you stemmed the tide of inflation. Because the Government put the fear of God into these congenital blood suckers. If you do not do it, how you have no price tags, you wil not preventively detain them. It is no good prosecuting them. They will go to lawyers as my friend said, and they will use some provision and get them released. (*Interruptions*) If you detain them you will find that the prices will come down immediately. I have a feeling. (*Interruptions*) Let us a nation count our blessings. (*Interruptions*) Thank God, we have got at least one real national Party and thank God, at least one national leader. (*Interruptions*).

AN HON. MEMBER: And thank God, there is one Frank Anthony!

MR. SPEAKER: Mr. Choubey, you should.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: They even laugh at the obvious.

[Shri Frank Anthony]

In any Government there are bound to be lapses weaknesses. But let me say this. Here at least we have not only the largest democracy, but a very stable democracy, acclaimed internationally, with increasing international respect and this increasing international respect is there for everyone to see except the Nihilists!

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी (नई दिल्ली): अध्यक्ष महोदय, आज़ादी की 36वीं वर्षगांठ पर प्रधान मंत्री ने लालकिले पर राष्ट्रीय ध्वज फहराते हुए देशवासियों से अपील की कि वह थोड़ा आत्म-निरीक्षण कर के देखें। मैं चाहता हूं प्रधान मंत्री जी, आप आत्म-निरीक्षण की प्रक्रिया स्वयं से प्रारम्भ करें।

अविश्वास के प्रस्ताव में खंडन-मंडन स्वाभाविक है, लेकिन आत्म-चिन्तन की प्रक्रिया सत्तारूढ़ दल में शुरू हो गई है और इसका पता लगता है सूचना मंत्री श्री वसन्त साठे के भाषण से। अभी हमारे कुछ कांग्रेस के मित्र शिकायत कर रहे थे कि प्रतिपक्ष अविश्वास का प्रस्ताव क्यों लाता है?

सच्चाई यह है कि अविश्वास प्रस्ताव के अलावा प्रधान मंत्री से दो,दो बातें करने का मौका अब सदन में नहीं मिलता है। यह कहा जा सकता है कि और मंत्री भी तो हैं, मगर स्वयं सूचना मंत्री कहते हैं कि कांग्रेस पार्टी एक तम्बू की तरह है जो एक खम्भे पर खड़ी है। अब अगर बात होनी है तो प्रधान मंत्री से होनी चाहिए, जो तम्बू के नीचे दुबके बैठे हैं, उनसे बातचीत करने का कोई लाभ नहीं।

इतना ही नहीं, वसन्त साठे जी ने कुछ और भी बातें गम्भीरता से कही हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : : नौकरी जाएगी उनकी।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : He said:

"Participating in a discussion organised by the Delhi Study Group here yesterday on 'Democracy strengthens' unity, he said superficial solutions neither solved problems nor ensure the balanced economic growth so essential for the survival of democracy."

Mark the word "Superficial". उन्होंने आगे कहा :

"He felt there was "no thinking" on these issues even in the cabinet or the Congress Working Committee.

When asked to elaborate his observation, he shot back: "You haven't heard me?"

Asked if he himself did any "thinking"', he said, he did and that was why he was talking about the problems. He warned about what had happened in Pakistan and Burma. A similar situation could arise in India too."

श्री सोम नाथ चटर्जी : मर गया।

एक माननीय सदस्य : रहम कीजिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : श्री साठे ने इस भाषण का खंडन नहीं किया है। सच्चाई तो यह है कि दिल्ली से पूना जाने के बाद तिलक जयन्ती पर जो भाषण उन्होंने दिया, उसमें अपनी आशंका को स्पष्ट शब्दों में प्रकट किया है। मैं सरकार पर आक्षेप लगाने के लिए उस भाषण का उपयोग नहीं करना चाहता, लेकिन आज जो देश की परिस्थिति है, प्रधान मंत्री अपने हृदय पर हाथ रख कर बतायें, क्या आप उस से संतुष्ट हैं?

एक माननीय सदस्य : बिल्कुल हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : ढाई साल बीत गये, आधी अवधि समाप्त हो गई, क्या लेखा-जोखा लेने का वक्त नहीं आया है?

जनता सरकार ने क्या किया, यह आज विवाद का विषय नहीं है।

एक माननीय सदस्य : क्यों नहीं है ?

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : ये सरकार में आ गए हैं मगर अभी तक ये पूरी तरह समझ नहीं पाए कि सरकार में आ गए हैं।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, महंगाई बढ़ने की चर्चा की जाती है, तो वित्त मंत्री कहते हैं कि यह वृद्धि सीजनल है। श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी जैसे सीजन्ड पालियामेंटरीयन सारी महगाई को सीजनल बताए, यह किसी के गले के नीचे नहीं उतरेगा।

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Even Shri Frank Anthony has admitted it.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : काश यह महंगाई मौसमी होती! लेकिन यह मौसमी नहीं है। यह अर्थ–नीतियों के परिवर्तन से जुड़ी है।

पिछले दो साल में जिस तरह से औद्योगिक नीति बदल गई है, लाइसेंस नीति में परिवर्तन किए गए, आयात-निर्यात व्यापार के मामले में रद्दो-बदल किए गए, उस सब का कुछ मिला कर परिणाम यह हो रहा है कि आम आदमी पिस रहा है, विदेशी कर्जा बढ़ रहा है और स्वावलम्बन के राष्ट्रीय लक्ष्य को हमेशा के लिए छोड़ा जा रहा है।

प्रधान मंत्री ने जब सत्ता सम्भाली, तब विदेशी कर्जा 10,000 करोड़ रुपए के करीब था—मार्च, 1980 में विदेशी कर्जे की राशि 10,000 करोड़ रुपए थी। मार्च, 1982 में वह बढ़ कर 15,459 करोड़ रुपए हो गई। आई एम एफ का ऋण अलग है, 1983 में इस ऋणं की राशि 20,000 करोड़ रुपए तक पहुंचेगी। 2 बिलियन डालर हमें ब्याज का चुकाना पड़ेगा। 7 से 8 बियिलयन डालर का हमारा व्यापार में घाटा होने वाला है। हम देश को किधर ले जा रहे हैं ?

एक माननीय सदस्य : तरक्की के रास्ते पर।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आई एम एफ लोन के साथ जो शर्तें लगी हैं, उनके अनुसार हम स्वावलंबन से हट रहे हैं। अब अनाज के मामले में भी हमें विदेशों की तरफ देखना है। ऐसी स्थिति में किस तरह से गुट-निरपेक्षता की नीति पर ईमानदारी से चला जा सकता है ? प्रधान मंत्री ने अमरीका में कहा कि अमरीका वालों ने मान लिया है कि

we are truly non-aligned.

प्रधान मंत्री (श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी): जहां तक मुझे याद है, मैंने यह नहीं कहा। ये आपके शब्द हैं।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : ये मेरे शब्द नहीं हैं। यह समाचारपत्रों में छपा हुआ है।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : उनकी हर एक बात न मानिए।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : आपकी तरफ से कोई खंडन नहीं किया गया है। आपके पास इतना बड़ा दफ्तर है, मैडम। **(व्यवधान)** और फिर मैं आपके प्रति-निधि मंडल में नहीं था। मैं कहां से होता ? विदेश मंत्री तक नहीं मैं। **(व्यवधान)** लेकिन अगर अखबारों में छपे हुए समाचार और भाषण का खंडन नहीं हुआ, तो मेरे लिए इसके सिवा और कोई रास्ता नहीं है कि मैं उसको सही मानूं। अगर प्रधान मंत्री कहती हैं कि उन्होंने यह नहीं कहा, तो वह बताएं कि उन्होंने क्या कहा।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : मैंने कहा कि we stand errect.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि हम न इधर झुकते हैं, न उधर झुकते हैं, हम सीधे खड़े रहते हैं। जब यही बात 1977 और 1978 में हमने कही थी, तब आपने कहा था कि अमरीका की तरफ झुकाव को छिपाने के लिए आप यह कह रहे हैं।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : आपने कहा था कि आप जैनविनली नान-एलाइन्ड हैं ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : और आप कह रही हैं कि आप ट्रूली नान-एलाइन्ड हैं । फर्क क्या है (**व्यवधान**) ।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : फर्क यह है कि नान-एलाइन्ड मूवमेंट हम पर विश्वास कर रहा है और हमारी तरफ देख रहा है और आप पर वह विश्वास नहीं करता था ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : नान-एलाइन्ड मूवमेंट किसी व्यक्ति की तरफ नहीं देखता, हिन्दुस्तान की तरफ देखता है और यह संयोग की बात है कि प्रधान मंत्री आज आप हैं । (**व्यवधान**) प्रधान मंत्री का समर्थन करने के लिए कैसे कैसे माननीय सदस्य खड़े हो रहे हैं । (**व्यवधान**)

MR. SPEAKER: No cross talking.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अगर प्रधान मंत्री की विदेश यात्रा के परिणाम स्वरूप अमेरीका के साथ हमारे सम्बन्धों में सुधार हुआ है, तो कोई उसका विरोध नहीं करेगा—अगर सुधार हुआ है, तो। लेकिन कुछ ऐसे प्रश्न हैं जिन का उत्तर प्रधान मंत्री ही दे सकती हैं । तारापुर के मामले में जो समझौता हुआ है, बार बार प्रधान मंत्री कहती हैं कि हम ने रीप्रोसेस करने का अधिकार नहीं छोड़ा । यह ठीक है कि अधिकार नहीं छोड़ा, मगर री-प्रोसेस करने का अवसर आपने छोड़ दिया है । अगर समझौता टूट जाता और समझौता तोड़ना अमेरिका के लिए अनैतिक होता वह 30 साल तक हमें एनरिच्ड यूरेनियम देने के समझौते से बंधे हुए हैं, उन से कहना चाहिए था कि अगर आप समझौता तोड़ रहे हैं, हम कहीं और से पाएंगे, हम अपने वैज्ञानिकों पर भरोसा करेंगे । मगर हम ने क्या किया ? अब हमें एनरिच्ड यूरेनियम फ्रांस से मिलेगा, मगर वाया अमेरिका मिलेगा । क्या फ्रांस से सीधा समझौता नहीं कर सकते थे ?

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : सीधा ही होगा ।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : हिन्दुस्तान और अमेरिका दोनों को मिल कर फ्रांस के पास जाने की क्या जरूरत है ? . . . . (**व्यवधान**) तारापुर के स्पेयर्स का क्या होगा ? स्पेयर्स के बारे में स्थिति स्पष्ट नहीं है । वहां स्टॉरेज कैपेसिटी नहीं है । हमें प्रयुक्त **ईंधन** हटाना पड़ेगा । कहां ले जाएंगे ? हम फ्रांस से सीधा समझौता कर सकते थे । अमेरिका को बीच में लाने की आवश्यकता नहीं थी ।

यह ठीक है कि अमेरिका के रुख में भी परिवर्तन हुआ है । लेकिन अमेरिका के रुख में परिवर्तन केवल भारत के बारे में नहीं हुआ है, ब्राजील के बारे में हुआ है, साऊथ अफ्रीका के बारे में हुआ है । लेकिन तारापुर का सवाल जिस तरह से हल होना चाहिए था, हल नहीं हुआ ।

पाकिस्तान को मिलने वाले हथियार के बारे में क्या फैसला हुआ ? पालम हवाई अड्डे पर प्रधान मंत्री से पूछा गया कि क्या अमेरिका ने कोई आश्वासन दिया है भविष्य के बारे में ? प्रधान मंत्री ने कहा कि मैंने आश्वासन मांगा ही नहीं । मांगा ही नहीं तो देने का क्या सवाल है ? हथियार मिलते रहेंगे । आखिर अमेरिका के साथ गलतफहमी पैदा हुई तो पाकिस्तान को दिए जाने वाले हथियारों को लेकर हुई, वे तारापुर समझौते से मुकर रहे हैं, इसको लेकर हुई । दोनों सवालों पर हम कहां पहुंचे ? मैं इसमें ज्यादा विस्तार से जाना नहीं चाहता क्योंकि मुझे जरा घरेलू मामलों की चर्चा भी करनी है ।

दिल्ली किस तरह से चल रही है ? प्रदेशों में गड़बड़ हो रही है, उसके लिए

[श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी]

कहा जाता है हम क्या करें ? राज्य का विषय है । दिल्ली किसके अधीन है ? दिल्ली पर सीधा केन्द्र का शासन है । प्रधान मंत्री ने कह दिया एकदम 24 घंटे के अन्दर दिल्ली में बिजली की व्यवस्था ठीक करो । अगर उस आदेश का पालन कर दिया जाता तो दिल्ली वाले खुश होते । हमको भी संतोष होता कि प्रधान मंत्री के शब्द की कोई कीमत है । 24 घंटे बीत गए । घंटे दिन में बदल गए, दिन हफ्तों में परिवर्तित हो गए । दिल्ली में ऐसे इलाके हैं जहां पांच पांच घंटे बिजली नहीं आती । मैं आंकड़े रख सकता हूं । डेसू पर खर्चा बढ़ रहा है । उत्पादन घट रहा है । यह रहस्य मेरी समझ में नहीं आता ।

अभी मेरे मित्र कह रहे थे कि क्या दिल्ली में आम आदमी को राहत पहुंचाने के लिए सिविल सप्लाइज कारपोरेशन नहीं बनाया गया ? उसको 1 करोड़ 90 लाख की पूंजी थी और 1 करोड़ का घाटा हो गया । 80 लाख रुपये एक चीनी के सौदे में गोलमाल कर दिए गए । चीनी मद्रास में खरीदी गई 850 रुपये क्विटल के भाव से दिल्ली के लिए चीनी खरीदी गई । दिल्ली में एक किलो भी नहीं आई, चीनी मद्रास में ही बेच दी गई 550 रुपये क्विटल के भाव । 80 लाख का घाटा हुआ है । कोई है जवाबदेह इस बारे में ?

दिल्ली में रेलों के तीन पुलों को चौड़ा करने की कोशिश की जा रही है--आजादपुर, नारायणा और एक पुल और है । उसके लिए मिट्टी की जरूरत थी । रेलवे मंत्रालय ने दिल्ली प्रशासन से कहा कि मिट्टी का इन्तजाम करो । 8 हजार ट्रक मिट्टी चाहिए थी । इसी समय दिल्ली का नजफगढ़ नाला खोदा जा रहा है, मिट्टी निकाली जा रही है दिल्ली प्रशासन ने कहा कि रेल के लिए हम मिट्टी नहीं दे सकते । आप अपना टेंडर निकालो । मिट्टी मंगाओ । नाले से मिट्टी निकालने के लिए अलग ठेका दिया गया । रेलवे ने अलग टेंडर दिए कि हमें मिट्टी चाहिए । दोनों ठेकेदार मिल गए । नजफगढ़ ड्रेन की मिट्टी रेलवे को दे दी गई और 1 करोड़ 10 लाख रुपया कमा लिया गया । ....(व्यवधान)....

क्या कोई यह मान सकता है कि यह काम ठेकेदार बिना अफसरों से मिले हुए कर सकते हैं ? क्या कोई यह मान सकता है कि अफसर यह काम बिना ऊपर के इशारे से कर सकते हैं ?

13.35 hrs.

(MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER in the Chair)

प्रेस की स्वाधीनता की चर्चा हुई है । ये जो घटनाएं हो रही हैं, यह अकेली नहीं हैं । बिल बिहार में आया । बिहार की सरकार प्रेस कौंसिल में शिकायत लेकर आज तक नहीं गई । कुछ पत्रिकाए ऐसी हो सकती हैं जो अनर्गल बातें लिखें । उनका ध्यान रखने का काम हमने प्रेस कौंसिल को सौंपा है । आवश्यकता हो तो प्रेस कौंसिल को और शक्तिशाली बनाया जा सकता है । मानहानि का कानून है । बिहार की सरकार केवल एक मामले में अदालत में गई है और उस मामले में भी 8 बार एडजर्नमेंट लिया है बिहार की सरकार ने । अगर आप समझते हैं कि मानहानि हुई है तो मुकदमा चलाइए । मगर बिहार को छोड़िए । बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री बिना केन्द्र के इशारे के इतना बड़ा काम नहीं कर सकते और अगर बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री इतना बड़ा काम बिना केन्द्र के इशारे के करने लगे हैं तो मानना पड़ेगा कि जिस एक खम्भे पर यह तम्बू खड़ा है वह खम्भा भी कुछ हिलने लगा है ।

मगर दिल्ली में क्या हो रहा है ? दिल्ली में इंडियन एक्सप्रेस ने जो कुछ लिखा है उससे दिल्ली के दरबार में बड़ी नाराजगी है और इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के मालिकों से कहा

जा रहा है कि अरुण शौरी को निकाल दो। अगर अरुण शौरी को मैगसैसे एवार्ड नहीं मिलता तो अरुण शौरी को इंडियन एक्सप्रेस से निकालने का नोटिस मिल गया होता। इंडियन एक्सप्रेस के मालिक अरुण शौरी को निकालना नहीं चाहते। उन पर कौन दबाव डाल रहा है ?

दिल्ली से एक हिन्दी साप्ताहिक निकलता है। उस हिन्दी साप्ताहिक ने राष्ट्रपति के चुनाव के समय एक लेख प्रकाशित किया। लेख में ज्ञानी जैल सिंह की कुछ आलोचना थी। आप जानते हैं उस पत्रकार को अब नौकरी से हटाया जा रहा है और राजनैतिक दबाव में हटाया जा रहा है। ग्वालियर में आन्ग्रे के खिलाफ जो कार्याही हुई है.... (व्यवधान)....

You have to give me more time.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You have to conclude now.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: How can I conclude? You have to keep the House in order.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, आंग्रे ने 'सूर्य' को खरीदा, वह उनका अपना फैसला है। 'सूर्य' में जो कुछ प्रकाशित हो रहा है मैं उसका समर्थन नहीं करता। लेकिन सूर्य को बात लिखने का अधिकार है या नहीं ? अगर चोरी का आरोप होता तो राजमाता सिन्धिया के खिलाफ होता, आंग्रे के खिलाफ नहीं होता.. (व्यवधान)....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इस सदन में सिसवा काण्ड की काफी चर्चा हो चुकी है। शायद पहली बार इतना लज्जाजनक कांड हुआ है जिसमें कि महिलाओं पर बलात्कार करने में पुलिस वाले भी शामिल हैं। वहां की महिलाओं का एक प्रतिनिधि-मण्डल प्रधान मन्त्री को आकर मिला था और शायद प्रधान मन्त्री ने उनको आश्वासन दिया था कि सी बी आई उसकी जांच करेगी लेकिन उसकी जांच शुरू नहीं की गई है। आज हालत यह है कि सिसवा में जाकर उन अभागी औरतों से कहा जा रहा है कि तुम्हें रुपया चाहिए तो रुपया ले लो, कपड़े चाहिए तो कपड़े ले लो, बरतन चाहिए तो बरतन ले लो लेकिन यह मत कहो कि तुम्हारे साथ बलात्कार किया गया है। मेरे पास वहां के नागरिकों द्वारा लिखी गई चिट्ठी आई है, मेरे पास समय नहीं है कि मैं इसको पढ़कर सुना सकूं.... (व्यवधान)....

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is all right.

Hon. Members, we must conduct the House in a orderly manner. I make a very humble request to you. Whenever any Member from this side speaks, all of you, please note down the points and when you are called, you repudiate those points—or you attack on those points. That is the Parliamentary procedure. That is the correct Parliamentary procedure. I would request every now and then, when somebody speaks this side, nobody should interrupt him. Note down all those points and you reply to it. That is the proper procedure. I would humbly request you to follow this procedure.

Yes, Mr. Vajpayee, you have to conclude now.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, बिहार में भूमिहीन हरिजनों पर अत्याचार ढाए जा रहे हैं, उनका कत्लेआम हो रहा है इसलिए कि वे सरकार द्वारा नियुक्त मजूरी मांग रहे हैं। दुर्भाग्य की बात यह है कि जो विशुद्ध साम्प्रदायिक दंगे हैं उन्हें दो बदमाशों के गिरोह के दंगे के रूप में पेश किया जा रहा है। अभी मुंगेर-जमालपुर में जो दंगा हुआ है उसमें 14 व्यक्ति मारे गए। उसमें बच्चे मारे गए हैं, औरतें मारी गई हैं। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं.... (व्यवधान)..

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF ENERGY (SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN): On a point of order. Are we going to raise State subjects in the House or we should discuss on the policy matter?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Can we, therefore, discuss West Bengal also and there will be no noise from that side?

SHRIMATI PRAMILA DANDAVATE (Bombay North Central): Yes, discuss.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: We have been discussing a number of communal riots in this House.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is better if you avoid the subject concerning the riots. On a No-confidence Motion, I think, this side or that side, will touch the issues and the policies. It would be proper. Added, to that, I would request, please see any State subject is not touched. If, somebody will touch, then it will not be a proper discussion. I would suggest, please avoid any State subject.

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD (Saharanpur): I am on point of order.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Under what Ruble.

SHRI RASHEED MASOOD: Under Rule 376.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the point of order?

श्री रशीद मसूद : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, बिजनेस एडवाइजरी कमेटी में तय हुआ था कि कम्युनल रायट्स डिस्कस होंगे लेकिन मौका नहीं मिला कम्युनल रायट्स डिस्कस करने का । लिहाजा कम्युनल रायट्स को रेफ़र करने का पूरा अख्तियार मेम्बर्स को है । (व्यवधान) ....चूंकि बहुत इंटेसिव तौर पर यह चीजें हो रही हैं लिहाजा मेम्बर्स को नहीं रोका जा सकता है ।

[شری رشید مسعود : ڈپٹی اسپیکر صاحب - بزنس ایڈوائزری کمیٹی میں طے ہوا تھا کہ کمیونل رائٹس ڈسکس ہوں گے لیکن موقع نہیں ملا کمیونل رائٹس ڈسکس کرنے کا - لہذا کمیونل رائٹس کو ریفر کرنے کا پورا اختیار ممبرس کو ہے -

....(انٹرپشن)....

چونکہ بہت انٹینسو طور پر یہ چیز ہو رہی ہے لہذا ممبرس کو نہیں روکا جا سکتا ہے -]

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have said that on a No-confidence Motion, only the policy should be touched. It is regarding certain policies of the Government of India and the Council of Ministers.

(Interruptions)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please allow me. I am on my legs. Please sit down. Some instances have been cited.

(Interruptions)

SOME HON. MEMBERS *rose*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. The fundamental thing you must know is when the Chair is on its legs, no Member will stand.

SOME HON MEMBERS rose

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit sit down. When I am on my legs, please sit down. Unless you know that you must obey the Chair, you cannot be a successful Parliamentarian.

(Interruptions)

AN HON. MEMBER *rose*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please sit down. I am asking you, please sit down. Hon. Members, this is a discussion on No-confidence Motion. This is a No-confidence Motion on the Council of Ministers or the Central Government. Some instances are cited. Are these Ministers responsible for those instances. Therefore, I say, please touch the policies of the Government of India.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: May I seek a clarification? Are we not entitled to discuss the failure of the Government to maintain communal harmony?

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You must. (*Interruptions*) About the instance that you have quoted, these Ministers are not responsible; the Central Government is not responsible. Now, you carry on. Mr. Vajpayee, you are a very learned and great leader. I think, you know this. Please help me.

(व्यवधान)

श्री फूल चन्द वर्मा: (शाजापुर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, यह डबल स्टैंडर्ड नहीं चलेगा.. (व्यवधान) ....

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी :मैं जानता हूं कि बिहार में राज्य सरकार है और उससे जवाब तलब किया जा सकता है । मैं तो प्रधान मंत्री का ध्यान एक विशेष स्थिति की ओर दिलाना चाहता हूं । उस गांव में पुलिस तैनात थी, होमगार्ड्स तैनात थे .... (व्यवधान) ....प्रधानमंत्री लाल किले पर खड़े होकर कम्यूनल रायट्स की, माइनोरिटीज की बात कर सकती हैं, मैं सदन में खड़े होकर नहीं कह सकता.... (व्यवधान) ....वहां पर वे सारे देश का जवाब देने के लिए तैयार हैं । प्रधानमंत्री को वहां पर कहना चाहिए था—मैं खाली यूनियन टेरिटरीज के लिए बोल रही हूं, राज्यों के लिए नहीं बोल रही हूं .... (व्यवधान) ....

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, 19 जून, 1982 को उस गांव में सात होमगार्ड्स थे और एक मजिस्ट्रेट तैनात थे । 20 जून को तीन सिपाहियों ने अपने को बीमार घोषित करा लिया । बन्दूक रखकर चले गए, बाकी के सिपाही भी चले गए, मजिस्ट्रेट भी चले गए । यह संयोग नहीं है । इसकी जांच होनी चाहिए और पता लगाया जाना चाहिए कि इसमें कहां तक सच्चाई है, कहीं दंगाइयों से ये लोग मिले तो नहीं थे ।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात कह कर खत्म करना चाहता हूं....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now. I will call the next speaker if you are not concluding in time. You have got to conclude now.

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY: You take more time than the members.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : 17 सितम्बर, 1981 को इसी सदन में प्रधानमंत्री ने बहस का जवाब देते हुए एक बात कही थी, मैं उसको उद्धृत करना चाहता हूं :

> "I do not want to go into the cases against me. But one case I do want to mention. I wonder whether you know about it. I had to go all the way to Imphal, Manipur, on a non-bailable warrant. Do you know what the charge was? I was supposed to be an abettor to a person who had stolen two chickens and six eggs. This was the highest theme in which the Janata Party had charged character and democracy..."

उनकी बात सुनकर हम लोग सन्नाटे में आ गए थे । इस तरह के छोटे आरोप में कौन प्रधानमंत्री को इम्फाल घसीट कर ले गया । लेकिन बाद में मैंने सारे तथ्य इकट्ठे किए । यह बात गलत है कि प्रधानमंत्री के खिलाफ़ कोई नॉन-बेलेबल वारन्ट इशू किया गया था.... (व्यवधान) ....यह बात गलत है.... (व्यवधान) ....

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILISERS (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR): Warrant was issued, (*Interruptions*)

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : प्रधानमंत्री के खिलाफ़ समन इशू किया गया था.... (व्यवधान) ....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I gave notice under Direction 115, I have

[Prof. Madhu Dandavate]

got all the documents. I had given the Trikha Commission's documents to establish that...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: I am perfectly in order. Is it not a fact that Mrs. Gandhi was summoned... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR: I am prepared to resign the seat in Parliament...(*Interruptions*) Supposing, if you are wrong on the point...(*Interruptions*) ...you say that from Imphal...(*Interruptions*) that was the Trikha Commission which was enquiring into the whole thing, that the bailable* warrant against Mrs. Gandhi was not issued, if what you say is correct, then I am prepared to resign the Parliament seat.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: As an accused.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR: If what you say is not correct, then, you must resign from the Parliament seat.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am rising on a point of order.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: He has raised a point. Let him reply to that. I am not allowing anybody, only Mr. Vajpayee.

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : मैंने जो कुछ पढ़ा है, उसमें दो बातें हैं.... (व्यवधान)....प्रधानमंत्री ने दावा किया है कि उनके खिलाफ़ नान-बेलएबिल वारन्ट इशू किया गया था । मेरा कहना यह है कि उनके खिलाफ़ समन जारी किया गया था, नान-बेलएबिल वारन्ट नहीं ।

Let the matter be referred to the Privileges Committee and I will produce the documents.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You must conclude.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am rising on a point of order.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: What about the other point? Were these summons to Imphal issued to give evidence or was she summoned as an accused? Now you tell us.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR: If you were to be there, at the time she was cross-examined, the whole day, right from 10.30 onwards up to 6 O'Clock that was not evidence...

(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am rising on a point of order and even the Deputy Speaker has no right to say that a Point of Order cannot be raised.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is your point of order?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: My point of order is....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: What is the rule that has been infringed now?

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I am rising on a Point of Order under Rule 376. Just now the Hon. Minister for Petroleum who was formerly the Law Minister has raised a very important law point. When Shri Vajpayee has made a certain statement, he has got up and tried to contradict that.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Because he yielded.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: I want to point out that the Hon. Minister for Petroleum has contradicted what Shri Vajpayee has said. I wish to bring out to you the fact that I have already submited to the Speaker certain documents.

*The original words of the Minister of Petroleum, Chemicals and Fertilisers (Shri P. Shiv Shankar) were 'non-bailable warrant'.

The correction, as printed above, was made by the Minister while returning the transcript.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have already said that it is under the active consideration of the Speaker. There is no point of order here.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: That is a different issue. That is under 115. Let me conclude my submission, Sir, I have not yet concluded my submission.

(Interruptions)

आचार्य भगवान देव (अजमेर) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, इनकी गाड़ी पटरी से उतर गई है, इनको आप रोकिये ।....(व्यवधान)....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Mr. Shiv Shankar is trying to give an impression to the House that the Prime Minister was issued a warrant of arrest. Actually here is the legal counsel, Mr. Mahajan, who has said....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: It is not a point of order. I rule out the point of order.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR: I will answer it.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: May I know what you have ruled out?

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: The other things will not go on record.

*(Interruptions)***

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Don't record.

Mr. Vajpayee, you can continue now.

SHRI ATAL BIHARI VAJPAYEE: Mr. Shiv Shankar has thrown a challenge. I accept that challenge. But how do we decide this matter? Let the entire issue be referred to the Privileges Committee, and I am prepared to abide by its verdict.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKAR: Why Privileges Committee? Let it be decided straight here.

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत (पूर्व दिल्ली) : डिप्टी स्पीकर महोदय, अभी मैंने वाजपेयी जी का भाषण सुना ।

उन्होंने कुछ चर्चा दिल्ली और दिल्ली की बातों की की । मैं इस डिबेट को दिल्ली के बारे में डिबेट में नहीं बदलना चाहता हालांकि मैं उन बातों का जिक्र जरूर करूंगा जिनको वाजपेयी जी ने कहा है । यह खुशी की बात है कि वाजपेयी जी को कुछ दिल्ली का ध्यान तो आया है हालांकि वाजपेयी जी ने दिल्ली की एक-दो बातों की चर्चा नहीं की, जिनके बारे में मैं अभी थोड़ी देर में कहूंगा । उन्होंने उस बात की चर्चा नहीं की, जो दिल्ली में कल हुई है । उस की चर्चा उन्होंने नहीं की । दिल्ली में जो नई इलेक्ट्रिक ट्रेन चालू हुई है, जिससे लाखों लोगों को फायदा होगा, उसकी चर्चा भी इन्होंने नहीं की । मैं तो यह कहूंगा कि प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी, वाजपेयी जी पर बहुत मेहरबान हैं । मुझे इससे भी कोई शिकायत नहीं है कि प्रधान मंत्री जी इन पर बहुत मेहरबान हैं लेकिन मैं यह कहूंगा कि इनकी जो नई दिल्ली की कांस्टीटुएन्सी है, उसमें इनको कुछ करने-धरने की जरूरत नहीं है । नई दिल्ली देश की राजधानी है, इसलिए सरकार वहां पर सड़कें चौड़ी कर देती है या फ्लाई-ओवर बना देती है और इस तरह के सारे काम कर देती है । नई दिल्ली में सबसे अच्छा काम हो रहा है और उसको सब तरह की सुविधाएं दी जा रही हैं, तो फिर वाजपेयी जी को कुछ करने की जरूरत क्या है । प्रधान मंत्री जी वह सब कुछ कर रही हैं, इसलिए उनको लोगों के पास आने-जाने की फुरसत नहीं है और जो लोगों के लिए कुछ काम करने होते हैं, लोगों के कागजों पर कुछ दस्तखत करने का जो काम होता है, वह उनकी जगह मुझे करना पड़ता है और अब ये बातें कर रहे हैं दिल्ली की । वाजपेयी जी फ्री नहीं हैं इन कामों को करने के लिए ।

**Not recorded.

[श्री एच०के०एल० भगत]

वाजपेयी जी ने चेलेंज दे दिया और चेलेंज हो गया। मैं वाजपेयी जी का बहुत एडमाइरर हूं। मैं चाहता हूं कि वे अपनी मेमोरी को ताजा करें। मैं कोई जाती बात इसमें नहीं लाना चाहता था लेकिन एक वाक्या मेरे साथ हुआ और वह इनके जमाने में हुआ था। सन् 1977 के बीच में अखबारों में वह छपा था और वह यह था कि इन्होंने बहुत से लोगों के पासपोर्टों को जब्त कर लिया था और उसमें मेरा पासपोर्ट भी था।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You said you were a lover of Mr. Vajpayee. You must know that he is a bachelor.

श्री एच० के एल० भगत : मुझे बहुत ताज्जुब हुआ और यह उस वक्त किया जा रहा था जबकि वाजपेयी जी विदेश मंत्री थे और विदेश मंत्रालय द्वारा पासपोर्ट के कागजात को जब्त करने का काम हुआ। उसके बाद जब हम जीत कर वापस आ गये, तो मैंने एक दिन वाजपेयी जी से लाइब्रेरी में पूछा कि वाजपेयी जी, मेरा पासपोर्ट क्यों जब्त किया गया था? आपका पासपोर्ट जब्त हुआ, मुझे तो पता ही नहीं। विदेश मंत्री, विदेश मंत्रालय के हुक्म से बिना किसी जांच के, बिना किसी इन्क्वायरी के, हमारे हारने के बाद हमारे पासपोर्ट जब्त होते हैं, संजय गांधी का, मेनका गांधी का, पासपोर्ट जब्त होता है और कई लोगों के पासपोर्ट जब्त किये गये लेकिन वाजपेयी जी को मालूम नहीं। इस बारे में मैं और ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहता।

14 hrs.

एक उन्होंने दिल्ली का चर्चा किया। उन्होंने दिल्ली की सिविल सप्लाईज कारपोरेशन की मिसाल दी कि चीनी खरीदने में 80 लाख रुपये का घाटा हुआ। यह एक साल या डेढ़ साल का वाकया है। जब इस बारे में इनकी पार्टी के लोकल लोगों ने इल्जाम लगाया था तो दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन ने जवाब दिया था कि वह जो चीनी खरीदी गयी थी वह किसी प्राइवेट पार्टी से नहीं खरीदी गयी थी, वह गवर्नमेंट टू गवर्नमेंट ट्रांजेक्शन हुआ था।

एक माननीय सदस्य : आप इसकी जांच से क्यों डरते हैं? (व्यवधान)

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि साल डेढ़ साल पहले एक इल्जाम लगाया गया था जिसके बारे में दिल्ली एडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का कहना यह है कि यह इल्जाम कतई गलत है। आज डेढ़ साल के बाद, नो कांफिडेंस मोशन के समय वाजपेयी जी उसकी चर्चा करते हैं, इससे मालूम होता है कि उन्हें दिल्ली की हालत के बारे में कितनी दिलचस्पी है, कितनी वाकफ़ियत है।

How ignorant he is about Delhi!

यह जरा आप सोचें। इन्होंने एक ठेके का जिक्र कर दिया कि मिट्टी यहां से उठायी गयी, वहां से उठायी गयी। मुझे ऐसा लगता है कि कांट्रेक्टर्स से इनकी काफी वाकफ़ियत है और वे इनको मिल-जुल कर बताते रहते हैं।

मैं तो इनका आदर करता हूं क्योंकि इनको चुटकुलेबाजी में और जुमलेबाजी में काफ़ी महारत हासिल है जिसका कि उनसे कोई मुकाबला नहीं कर सकता है। अभी इन्होंने चर्चा किया कि जनता के जमाने में क्या हुआ, हम ऐसी बात न करें। आप खुद ऐसी बातें उठा रहे हैं।

अभी इन्होंने कहा कि आदर हिन्दुस्तान का हुआ, प्रधान मंत्री जी ने तो इन्टरवीन किया। प्रधान मंत्री ने तो खुद कहा कि नान इलाइनमेंट वाले हमारी कद्र करते हैं, हिन्दुस्तान की कद्र करते हैं। उन्होंने तो हमेशा यह कहा है कि हिन्दुस्तान की कद्र होती है। लेकिन पहले में और आज में फर्क है।

प्रधान मंत्री जी ने हमेशा यह कहा है कि यह हिन्दुस्तान की कद्र होती है । लेकिन आज फर्क इतना ही है कि जहां प्रधान मंत्री मोरारजी भाई और वाजपेयी जी के जमाने में हिन्दुस्तान की बेकद्री होती थी, आज इन्दिरा जी की रहनुमाई में कद्र होती है । उस जमाने में और आज के जमाने में यह फर्क है । आपसे हम कुछ ज्यादा कहना नहीं चाहते क्योंकि आप तो हमेशा विदेशों में रहते थे । क्या हुआ आपके जमाने में ? बूटस्ट्रेप डिप्लोमेसी हुई । यू0एस0ए0 के प्रेजीडेंट ने क्या कहा आपसे? आपने कहा कि तारापुर सेल आउट यह बहुगुणा जी ने कहा । उनके तारापुर सेल आउट कहने पर मुझे ताज्जुब होता है । हम यह नहीं मानते हैं । हमारी प्रधानमंत्री ने आते ही यह कहा कि मैं कोई अश्योरेंस लेने अमेरिका नहीं गयी थी । मोरारजी अश्योरेंस मांगने गये थे । अश्योरेंस भिखारी मांगने जाते हैं, अश्योरेंस लोग नीची गर्दन करके मांगने जाते हैं । ऊंची गर्दन करके जाने वाले अश्योरेंस नहीं मांगते । हमारी प्रधान मंत्री ने जाते समय भी यह कह यिदा था कि मैं आर्म्स खरीदने नहीं जा रही हूं, मैं भीख मांगने नहीं जा रही हूं, मैं किसी से मदद लेने के लिए नहीं जा रही हूं, मैं तो हिन्दुस्तान का पक्ष अमेरिका के सामने रखने जा रही हूं । इस बात को सारी दुनिया ने माना है, दुनिया के अखबारों ने माना है । (व्यवधान)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You please address the Chair. You do not reply to them.

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : मैं यह कह रहा था कि सारी दुनिया ने और हिन्दुस्तान के सारे अखबारों ने और उन अखबारों ने जिनके कि ये सबसे बड़े सपोर्टर हैं, ने इस बात को माना है । दुनिया के अखबारों में भी इसके बारे में लिखा गया है । 'न्यूयार्क टाइम्स' ने लिखा है कि तारापुर का जो मामला है,

"It is Reagan's surrender to Indira Gandhi."

मैं इसको सरेण्डर नहीं मानता । ये क्या इससे डिनाई करते हैं ? ये यह बात कहते हैं, मुझे इससे ताज्जुब होता है । मैं वाजपेयी जी से एक बात कहना चाहता हूं मोरारजी देसाई ने दो बातें कही थीं न्यूक्लियर एक्सप्लोजन के बारे में । वाजपेयी जी उस समय नहीं बोले, मोरारजी की राय के खिलाफ़ नहीं बोले । मोरार जी ने कहा कि हम पीसफुल परपजेज के लिए भी एक्सप्लोजन नहीं करेंगे, तब भी वाजपेयी जी नहीं बोले, मोरारजी ने कहा कि मैं नहीं कह सकता कि पोखरन का जो एक्सप्लोजन था वह पीसफुल परपजेज के लिए था, तब भी वाजपेयी जी नहीं बोले ।

आज इंदिरा जी की चाहे यू एस ए की विजिट हो, चाहे फ्रांस की विजिट हो या जापान की विजिट हो उससे दुनिया भर में हिन्दुस्तान की जगह बनी है, जिस तरीके से इंदिरा जी ने देश को चलाया है उसका एक असर दुनिया भर में पड़ा है । लेकिन बहुगुणा जी की कप्टेंसी में नो कान्फीडेंस मोशन आया तो उन्होंने कुछ कहना था । लेकिन एक रीजन यह भी है कि इस समय दुनिया भर में हिन्दुस्तान की इमेज और बढ़ गई है, मजबूत होती जा रही है तो इस समय हिन्दुस्तान को पालियामेंट में खड़े होकर कुछ पोलीटिकल डस्ट फेंकनी चाहिए, एक मोटिव यह भी है ।

अब मैं बहुगुणा जी पर आता हूं, उनका मैं आदर करता हूं । हमारे बहुत पुराने साथी हैं । हमने मिलकर बहुत काम किया है । 1976 के अन्त तक वे हमारे साथ रहे, इमरजेंसी में भी हमारे साथ थे । इमरजेंसी को इन्होंने सपोर्ट किया । प्राइम-मिनिस्टर की कोठी पर जो सालीडरिटी लीज हुई, उनमें सबसे आगे थे । मैं जो वाकयात कह रहा हूं, उससे बहुगुणा जी डिनाई नहीं कर सकते, क्योंकि मैं फैक्ट्स पर बोल रहा हूं । हमारे हारने के बाद हमारे ऊपर मुकदमे चले । कहा गया था कि डी टी सी की बसें ली गई और किराया नहीं लिया गया, मिस यूज

[श्री एच० के० एल० भगत]

हुआ। उसमें डी टी सी के कुछ अफसर निकाले गए, हम लोगों पर मुकदमे चले। उसमें श्री हेमवती नन्दन बहुगुणा का नाम भी था, जिस नाम को बाद में बदल कर इनके सेक्रेटरी श्री हेलन का नाम लिखा गया—हो कांट डिनाई, और उस समय इन्होंने क्लेम किया था कि यू0 पी0 में इमरजेंसी के सपोर्ट में सबसे बड़ी रैली हुई थी। उसके बाद अभी इन्होंने जयप्रकाश नारायण जी का जिक्र किया। उन्होंने कहा था कि "मैं यू0 पी0 की गवर्नमेंट के खिलाफ संघर्ष नहीं करूगा"। मैं नहीं जानता कि उन्होंने कहा था या नहीं कहा था और जयप्रकाश नारायण जी के बारे में उन्होंने कितनी बार कहा, यह वे स्वयं बता देंगे, लेकिन बहुगुणा जी के बहुगुणों में से एक गुण यह भी है कि ये जयप्रकाश नारायण जी को खुश भी कर लें और उनकी निन्दा भी कर लें।

अभी समर मुखर्जी साहब ने एक बात कही, मैं उनकी बहुत इज्जत करता हूं, उन्होंने कहा कि इंदिरा जी और उनके बेटे संजय गांधी बहुगुणा जी के घर पर गए। घर पर गए तो कोई गुनाह नहीं किया। मुझे याद है कि बहुगुणा जी जब नेहरू जी की समाधि पर आए थे, तब वहां पर उन्होंने कहा था और हमने सुना भी था कि "इंदिरा जी आपके चरण हमारे घर में पड़ेंगे तो हमारा घर पवित्र हो जाएगा"। इंदिरा जी खुद होकर गई, तब भी मैं नहीं कहता कि उन्होंने बुरा किया। (व्यवधान)

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I deny that this is totally fictitious.

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: This is hundred per cent. correct.

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक बात और कहता हूं कि इंदिरा जी खुद गई थीं या बहुगुणा जी ने कहा था, इससे कोई फर्क नहीं पड़ता। बहुगुणा जी हमारे साथ आ गए, हमारी पार्टी में आ गए। ये इंदिरा जी के बारे में बहुत कुछ कहते हैं। अभी इंदिरा जी चली गई हैं नहीं तो उनके सामने कहना मुश्किल होता। बहुगुणा जी इतने होशियार हैं कि इन्होंने इंदिरा जी को भी चक्कर में ले लिया और मुझे तो अब भी डर है कि कहीं फिर कांग्रेस (आई) में न आ जाएं।

इसलिए मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि जहां तक बहुगुणा जी का ताल्लुक है, ये सिर्फ 1977 से लेकर 1980 तक ढाई साल कांग्रेस से अलग रहे। उससे पहले कांग्रेस में जो अच्छी से अच्छी पोजीशन हो सकती थी, वह इनको मिली। जनरल सेक्रेटरी रहे, यू0 पी0 में मंत्री रहे, मुख्यमंत्री रहे...। मुझे भी सौभाग्य मिला उनके साथ काम करने का, उनके साथ मिल कर चुनाव आर्गनाइज करने का। मैं उनकी तारीफ करता हूं और उनकी क्वालिटीज को खूब जानता हूं। मुझे ताज्जुब यह है कि साढ़े तीन साल वह कांग्रेस से बाहर रहे लेकिन फिर भी पैंतीस साल की मुल्क की तरक्की को झुठला रहे हैं, उसकी निन्दा कर रहे हैं।

करप्शन की बात पर मैं आता हूं। बहुत ज्यादा यहां करप्शन की चर्चा की जाती है। किसी जाती बात पर मैं जाना नहीं चाहता हूं, एक या दो तीन आदमियों के खिलाफ कोई करप्शन की बात करना नहीं चाहता हूं और न ही यह मौका है इस तरह की बात करने का। लेकिन अजीब हालत है। गाडगिल साहब ने इसकी चर्चा की है। जो आदमी कांग्रेस का हो और अगर अपोजीशन में चला जाए, उसके साथ चल जाए तो सारी करप्शन की बात खत्म हो जाती है और वह पवित्र हो जाता है लेकिन अगर कांग्रेस में रहता है तो करप्ट रहता है। बीजू पटनायक कांग्रेस में थे तो करप्ट थे, अपोजीशन में चले गए तो उनकी करप्शन खत्म हो गई। इस तरफ से चिमन भाई पटेल की बात मैं कहना चाहता हूं। मैं इसके बारे में कुछ नहीं जानता।

लेकिन जो अखबारों में छपा है वह बताता हूं। इसका खडंन भी नहीं हुआ है। राम जेठमलानी ने इसका खडंन नहीं किया है। चिमन भाई पटेल ने कहा है अंतुले साहब के बारे में। मैं केस के मेरिट्स में नहीं जा रहा हूं। उन्होंने कहा है कि तुम हमारे साथ मिल जाओ तो हम तुम्हारे खिलाफ केस नहीं करेंगे––

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : खंडन किया है।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : राम जेठ-मलानी ने नहीं किया है।

श्री अटल बिहारी वाजपेयी : किया है।

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : हम जरा सोचें इस करप्शन के मामले पर भी। इतने साल हमारे मुल्क को आजाद हुए हो गए हैं लेकिन फिर भी हमारे मुल्क में प्रजातन्त्र टिका हुआ है। हम जरा सोचें कि हमारे इर्द-गिर्द के मुल्कों का क्या हाल है। आप पाकिस्तान को देखें, इंडोनेशिया को देखें और किसी हद तक बंगलादेश को देखें। इस तरह से कुछ और भी देश हैं उनको आप देखें। वहां हमेशा यह हुआ है कि वहां को जो पोलिटिकल लीडरशिप थी उसके खिलाफ करप्शन के एलीगेशन बार-बार लगाए गए, वाइल्ड एलीगेशन लगाए गए, उनको वहां की पोलिटिकल लीडरशिप को, डेमोक्रेटिक इस्टीट्यूशंज को डेनीग्रेड किया गया और नतीजा यह हुआ कि अल्टीमेटली वहां डेमोक्रेसी ही खत्म हो गई। इसी तरह से हम भी देखते हैं कि जब ये विरोध में आ जाते हैं तो इस तरह की सारी बातें कहना शुरू कर देते हैं। आज जो करप्शन की इस तरह से चर्चा करते हैं वे इस चीज को नहीं समझते हैं।

पालियामेंट की चर्चा भी अभी की गई है। कहा गया है कि प्राइम मिनिस्टर हाउस में नहीं बैठतीं। प्राइम मिनिस्टर हैं, उनको बैठना चाहिये। यह उनकी जिम्मेवारी है। वाजपेयी जी बोले कि बहुगुणा जी गढ़वाल से जीत गए। मैं उनको बधाई देता हूं। वह दो तीन बार जीतने के बाद हाउस में आए हैं। आज उनके दर्शन अच्छी तरह से हुए हैं। वर्ना पांच-चार मिनट के लिए ही वह हाउस में बैठा करते थे। वाजपेयी जी बैठते हैं। चरणसिंह जी तो कभी कभी ही आते हैं और चले जाते हैं। लेकिन यह जो बात कही गई है इसका उत्तर पहले ही दिया जा चुका है।

वाजपेयी जी ने कहा कि प्रधान मंत्री जी खुद कहें कि देश की हालत से वह सन्तुष्ट हैं। लाल किले से कल उन्होंने कहा तो है कि देश में बहुत कुछ कठिनाइयां हैं, बहुत मुश्किलें हैं, उनको दूर करना है। मैं पूछना चाहता हूं कि सन्तुष्ट कौन है? मैं नहीं हूं, प्रधान मंत्री जी नहीं हैं, कोई नहीं है। फर्क इतना है कि देश की खराब हालत से आप फायदा उठाते हैं, उसको देख कर खुश होते हैं, उसका नाजायज फायदा उठाना चाहते हैं, हम उन कठिनाइयों से लड़ना चाहते हैं, उनका मुकाबला करना चाहते हैं। आपका एटीट्यूड नेगटिव है, प्योरली नगेटिव है, आबस्ट्रकशनिस्ट है जिसकी देश को जरूरत नहीं है।

This country does not need mere prophets of deem, despair and destruction like you but this country needs prophets of hope, hardwork and discipline like Indira Gandhi.

बहुगुणा जी ने कहा कि गढ़वाल हमारे लिए वाटरलू साबित हुआ है। आपकी विजय हुई, आपको मुबारिक। यह खुशी की बात है। लेकिन आप इससे इतने सैल्फ आबसेस्ड क्यों हैं? वाजपेयी जी जीते हैं, उनकी पार्टी एक दो चुनाव जीती है, पालियामेंट के भी जीती है, सी पी एम ने जीते हैं, कुछ और अपोजीशन पार्टीज ने जीते हैं। 1980 में कांग्रेस फिर पार्लियामेंट और ज्यादातर असम्बलीज के चुनाव जीत कर सत्ता में आई। तो एक आप वहां से जीत गये तो हमारा वाटरलू हो गया,

[श्री एच० के० एल० भगत]

और किसी जगह वाटरलू नहीं हुआ। लेकिन चूंकि बहुगुणा जी हैं इसलिये वाटरलू है। आप अपने बारे में इतना सैल्फ आबसेस्ड क्यों हैं? राजीव जी तो आपसे बहुत ज्यादा मेजारिटी से जीते हैं, आप अपनी जीत को सैल्फ ओबसेस्ड हो कर क्यों देखते हैं? जनता पार्टी के जमाने में जहां तक मुझे मालूम है 16 पार्लियामेंट के बाई-इलेक्शन हुए थे और उनमें से 9 सीटें कांग्रेस ने जीती थीं, मेजारिटी में हम जीते थे, उसमें से कुछ सीटें हमने आप से छीनी थीं। यही नहीं छोटा सा म्युनिसिपल कारपोरेशन का बाई-इलेक्शन हुआ था दिल्ली में वह सीट भी हमने जीती थी।

श्री फूल चन्द वर्मा : मध्य प्रदेश के सागर और जबलपुर में कांग्रेस की सीट्स हमने छीनी हैं।

(व्यवधान)**

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If the Hon. Member does not yield, you cannot interrupt. It will not go on record. Only if he yields you can interrupt. Otherwise it will not go on record.

(*Interruption*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You want freedom of Press; not freedom of speech in the Parliament!

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : डिप्टी स्पीकर साहब, जो बात मैं इनके हक में कह रहा हूं अगर वह भी इनकी समझ में न आये तो मैं क्या करूं? मैंने तो कहा मध्य प्रदेश में आपने जीती, आपको मुबारक।

मैं कह रहा था कि माननीय बहुगुणाजी ने कहा :

This Government represents nobody except vested interests.

जितने लोग हमारे चुन कर आये 1981, 1982 में क्या वह लोगों से चुन कर नहीं आये? सिर्फ यही चुन कर आये हैं? कौन इस बात को मानेगा। मैं दोहराना नहीं चाहता, श्री फ्रैंक ऐन्थनी साहब ने अच्छे ढंग से स्थिति को पेश किया। अभी जिक्र किया नार्थ ईस्ट फ्रंटियर में क्या हालत थी? वहां जो हालत थी पहले अगर वह कांसालीडेट की गई तो इंदिरा जी के जमाने में की गई, और आज भी उसको ठीक करने की कोशिश हो रही है।

श्री हेमवन्ती नन्दन बहुगुणा : कंसालिडेट किया रिबेलियन?

श्री एच० के० एल० भगत : हर जगह टुकड़े टुकड़े हुई चीजों को जोड़ा गया। आपको अपने अचीवमेंट पर भी शर्म आ रही है? आप जनरल सेक्रेटरी थे ए० आई० सी० सी० के।

आखिर में एक बात और कहना चाहता हूं, कम्युनल राइट्स, हरिजनों पर अत्याचार यह सारी बातें सदन में डिस्कस हो चुकी हैं। इस मुल्क में बहुत बड़ा काम 35 वर्ष में हुआ जिसमें बहुगुणा जी भी शामिल थे, और भी कई दोस्त हमारे थे जो हमारे साथी थे। और मैं समझता हूं जो मुल्क में अच्छा काम होता है, चाहे भले ही अपोजीशन गाली दे, मैं क्रेडिट देता हूं इनका भी क्रेडिट है कि 35 साल में देश ने काफी तरक्की की है और आइन्दा भी हमारा देश इसकी ओब्स्ट्रकशनिस्ट ऐप्रोच के बावजूद भी आगे जायेगा और हम कठिनाइयों का डट कर मुकाबला करेंगे।

माननीय वाजपेयी जी ने साठे जी की स्पीच की चर्चा की। मुझे नहीं मालूम उन्होंने क्या कहा, एक बात उन्होंने कही कि हमारी पार्टी में एक मजबूत खम्भा है। तो भाई यह

**Not recorded.

देश का सौभाग्य है, हमारी पार्टी का सौभाग्य है कि आज वह खम्भा केवल हिन्दुस्तान का ही खम्भा नहीं माना जाता है .... आज नान-एलाइड वर्ल्ड का खम्भा माना जाता है, जो पीसफुल फ़ोर्सेज का खम्भा माना जाता है।

अरे, एक तो है, तुम्हारे पास तो एक भी नहीं, जो छोटे छोटे खम्भे हैं वह दिन में 4 बार टूट रहे हैं। मालूम नहीं कि अगली दफे जब हम सेशन में मिलेंगे तो डी एस पी एक होगी या दो होगी।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं इसका अपोज करता हूं।

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Dr. Subramaniam Swamy. His party has been allotted ten minutes.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY (Bombay North East): Kindly use your discretion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I would request all the hon. Members to keep to their time. The Prime Minister shall be called to intervene at 7.00 O'clock sharp. No hon. Member should take more time; otherwise you should not blame that some hon. Members have not been given the opportunity.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I will finish before 7.00 O'clock.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: In that case, I would immediately call the Prime Minister to reply.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Sir, I rise in support of the no-confidence motion moved by Shri H. N. Bahuguna. In his reply, Shri Shukla devoted much of his attention to the character of Shri Bahuguna. All the quotations, he made, were pre-November, 1979, and those were published and the Government, today the ruling party, was aware of it, and after knowing all this, Shri Bahuguna was taken into their party and appointed Secretary-General. Therefore, Shri Shukla owes it to this House as to why they disregarded all this evidence that they found of such great importance today, and quoted in the House against Shri Bahuguna.

Now, why is it that I am supporting this motion? These thirty-one months of Congress (I) rule have, in my opinion, subverted one of the most cherished goals of our freedom struggle, and that is the goal of self-reliance. In every sector, I find that there is a back slide taking place. It is this which makes us worry, it is this on which I feel that the Government, in view of what they are doing, should resign.

On the economic front, let us see, how far they have gone on the path of self-reliance. Take the loan that the Government has taken from the International Monetary Fund. A great deal of anxiety, worry, was expressed by the members of the opposition when this loan was being discussed. Now, that 50 per cent of the loan has been taken, what is the country's position? Has it improved? In fact, if you look at the statistics, you find that, in effect, we have mortgaged the future generation. Already we have a debt of 15000 crores. This International Monetary Fund loan of 5,500 crores, when compounded with the interest rate, would mean repayment of 9000 crores. This repayment will have to start from January 1, 1985, and it will be at the rate of a thousand crores in foreign exchange every year for nine years along with an earlier debt repayment of 850 crores. That means that from January 1, 1985, this country will have to find 1850 crores of rupees in foreign exchange, over and above the present trade deficit that we are running, which is 6000 crores. Where is this going to come from? This means that the Government is certainly going to default in payment of this loan, or go back to the International Monetary Fund for rescheduling the debt, which means accepting more conditions. This is compounded with the fact that there is crude oil surplus developing in the world which means that the repatriation money that is coming at the rate of about 5000

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

crores cannot grow up any more. And there is recession in the West which means that the exports are not going to rise very much. By the end of this Government term, we are going to be faced with first class financial crisis; we will not be able to pay back the loans that we have contracted. This, in my opinion, is a very big slide-back in our self-reliance.

Recently, the Finance Minister wrote a letter to the International Monetary Fund on the 8th June, 1982 and in that he pointed out certain things that the Government has done in order to please the International Monetary Fund. This is what he said: "We have now engaged in major changes in pricing policy and these are being implemented." This is what the Finance Minister said. What does that mean? Rise in prices of steel, cotl, electricity and fertilisers. This has created a great deal of hardship for the middle-class and for the farmers. This is a policy which he is submitting to the IMF for their approval, assuming that they will approve, I mean they will say 'approved'.

Second, "We have opened up our oil exploration to foreign companies."

This is what he says in his letter. I would like to say to this House that scientists who are working on the ONGC, who have striven hard to put this country on its feet in the oil area, are complaining today that they are being denied opportunities. In fact foreign companies are moving in the areas where they should not be moving. Blocks and blocks are being reserved for them. This is what the Finance Minister has said in the letter.

Third thing, Sir, "Licensing policy has been greatly liberalised."

Now, what is the need for telling this to the International Monetary Fund that licencing policy has been liberalised? I am in favour of licensing system which is simple and automatic, which allows for small industries to grow. But according to this they say that many new industries have been taken out of the purview of the MRTP and that certain amount of automatic licensing capacity over and above what has been licenced already, that is permitted 130 per cent, 150 per cent etc. This means small industry in this country is going to be badly affected by the liberalisation which has been done at the instance of the International Monetary Fund.

Finally, Sir, they say:

"We have adopted a flexible and pregmatic approach to the import of technology and foreign colloboration."

This means nullification of our old policy of import substitution and plan priorities. International Monetary Fund loan was a big disaster for the country and it has put this country on a reverse gear as far as self-reliance is concerned. I would say that because of this backdrop on self-reliance, the United States, which was obstinate before about giving this loan enthusiastically supported our second instalment application in the International Monetary Fund and voted for it. This is one thing.

Another area where we had backdrop on self-reliance is the foodgrains area. Mr. Gadgil quoted statistics to show how everything has risen. Well, I want to know if you have record production of foodgrains, why was it necessary last year for you to import 2.65 million tonnes of wheat from Australia and the United States? One of the arguments given is that for procurement the farmers did not give enough to the Food Corporation. Well, the farmers did not give you because you were giving them only Rs. 130 per quintal. Anyway they went to the United States farmer, they want to the Australian farmer and paid Rs. 204 per quintal according to the answer they themselves gave in this House. They are prepared to pay a foreign farmer Rs. 204 per quintal for wheat, but the Indian farmer will not get what he wants. In this new season they have raised the procurement price to Rs. 142. but that is not what the Indian farmers want. They

want Rs. 160. If they get Rs. 160 they will dump all the wheat that they want. But I don't know the reason for why this psychology. Some people say when you purchase from abroad, you get commissions. This may be the motivating reason. I don't know, Sir.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Some people say, you are not saying.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Well, I don't know. How can I say, unless you allow me to head a commission and have it examined? But, anyway we do know in this discussion in this House in the Kuo Oil deal Rs. 15 crores were loss to the nation. To who it went. we don't know. In the Thal Vaishet matter, all the experts recommendations were over ruled, which meant Rs. 55 crores was loss to the nation. I would say that I am not therefore surprised why the inflation is taking place. It is taking place because of corruption. They say production is going up, then why are the prices also going up? I was a Professor of Economics. I used to teach my students when production goes up, the prices come down. But this Government has turned the laws of economics also upside down. They say production will also go up and the prices will also go up side by side. Prices are going up because of these policies, this reversal in self-reliance. That is the point.

Sir, I know you are getting impatient, therefore, I will not take much time.

Sir, it has become a popular pastime to condemn Janata Government performance for all the ills that have taken place. They have been in power for 31 months, so they cannot use it as Janata legacy, but in any case Janata legacy is well documented. It is there in the Economic Survey brought out by their Government. And I can even tell you the page number where the statistics show how we doubled the foreign exchange reserves, how we doubled the foodgrains stocks, how we increased the stock of gold, it is there...

AN HON. MEMBER: It is the legacy of 1975-76.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: There is an old saying that where ignorance is bliss, it is folly to be wise. But I will ask them, if they have time—I do not know whether they are in the habit of reading—there is the Economic Survey for 1981-82, and it is on page 123. They can see for themselves and answer.

AN HON. MEMBER: We have noted.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I have only one more point to make and that is regarding the Tarapore matter. There has been a backtrack on nuclear self-reliance. There is no question about it. I would not like to say that—I mean, I will not be the one who would allege an open sell-out by the Prime Minister, I think she is patriot like anybody else, and therefore there would not be anything consciously done,—but I would say she is either very badly advised or she does not know the factual situation. There has been a backtrack. I know that the Prime Minister was the one who conducts the underground explosion in 1974. But she was also the Prime Minister who wanted to sign the non-proliferation treaty in 1968, but it was the obstinacy of Shri Morarji Desai in her Cabinet, which prevented her from signing it. (*Interruptions*) She is also the Prime Minister who permitted the Central Intelligence to put all those instruments on Nanda Devi.

I want for her benefit also, to inform her, that she has made a deal in the United States which is most humiliating to the country. Even now she can backtrack. I do no know whether she is in a position, to do it. Instead of scrapping the 1963 treaty outright, she has chosen a proxy for the United States. That is France. Is France somehow a better country than the United States? I want to say that the USSR, USA, France, all these countries are part of the London suppliers' club. And they are all bound by the same discipline. Their attitude, whether it is the USSR or it is USA, it is the same as far as the safeguard is concerned. What did Mrs. Gandhi say

[Dr. Subramaniam Swamy]

in Parliament? I will refresh her memory and your memory. It was in the Question Hour.

AN HON. MEMBER: When? Last year?

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Just recently on the 11th August, 1982. You were not present too. (*Interruptions*) I had asked, 'why did you resurrect the treaty?' Mrs. Gandhi said that the treaty was not buried, that there was no question of resurrecting it or reviving it. I interrupted her if it was declared so. She answered—and this is very important to the extent or mis-information—"No, it was no. We said that we would do it if the USA did not supply. The words of the treaty are not that the United States will supply. The words are 'that they will make arrangements to supply'..." This is what the Prime Minister says. I went back, got the original treaty to see what the original treaty said, Article 2-A says,

> 'During the period of this agreement the United States will sell to the Government of India and the Government of India will purchase from the United States as needed, all requirements of the Government of India of enriched Uranium for the Tarapore Power station.'

Very clearly, it is stated, that the United States will supply and India will purchase from no one but the United States all the requirements that India needs for its Tarapore Station. It is a clear violation by the United States of this Treaty clause. But Mrs. Gandhi says, 'No. Their obligation was to find a supplier.' Now they have found a supplier. France is not a reliable supplier. She must know what is happening in Kalpakkam. France is obligated to supply fissile material there. Have they done it according to the schedule? Are they not dragging their feet? How can we be sure that in Tarapore they will supply? If France does not supply how can we expect it from the United States? Mrs. Gandhi and her Government had an alternative. The alternative was to have our mix oxide fuel. If Mrs. Gandhi's Government is truly committed to nuclear self-reliance, then all she has to do is to announce in this House that tomorrow, the fuel rods of the mix oxide MOX fuel are ready and they are going to be put in the reactor. And if she can do it, and say, "Yes, the mix oxide fuel is there and that it has been used even for one day" I am prepared to admit that she has come back with some kind of an agreement. But this is not so.

I know that you have given me lot of time. I am coming to the last point.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have said that it is the last point.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: I cannot stop in the middle.

Mrs. Gandhi gets very good coverage wherever she goes. But some of the things which she says abroad are different from what she says here. I would quote one such instance. If she denies it, it is all right. But if she stands by it, then, in my opinion, it is a matter of great regret. I am referring to a news item that appeared in 'The Times of India' dated 5 August, 1982. I quote:

> "She told Mr James Reston of "New York Times" last week that the problem of conversion..."

I am not going into nuclear conversion but religious conversion that has taken place in Meenakshipuram.

> "...enormous amounts of Arab money are coming. And they have made a conscious effort to convert the very poor, mostly Harijans and in one place some Christians as well."

I would like to know whether she stands by this opinion because this opinion is not the opinion of anybody, who has been to Meenakshipuram. I have been to Meenakshipuram. It is due to the atro-

cities committed against the Harijans that the conversion had taken place there and the Centre is responsible for that. If she feels that the Arab money—enormous amounts which she say—is responsible, then what is the use of her friendship with the Arab countries if she is not able to stop it? She should tell them to get out. If she says that this, in fact, is the position, then she should come forward in this House with documents, because we have had the debate here and the Government has not come forward with any such opinion.

Last of all, she has made another remark in the United States expecting that perhaps, some of us will not read her remark, but we read everything of what she says. She said:

> 'The emergency was imposed because her legal advisers and law minister and others thought that was the only way "we can do samething within the Constitution." Mrs. Gandhi denied that thousands of political opponents were arrested during the emergency. There were a large number of others who were arrested, line smugglers, dacoits and anti-social elments.'

I would like here to summon her own Home Ministry's files where she will find that 25,000 political opponents were arrested under the Maintenance of Internal Security Act, 35,000 were arrested under the DIR and hundred thousand more were arrested under breakage of Section 144 etc. In view of the available evidence, it appears that the Prime Minister does not really go through the notes in her own Government or she deliberately mis-informs the public.

Therefore, in view of the fact that the country's self-reliance is gravely being compromised, I would say to this Government, for God's sake and for country's sake, resign and go.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT (Ahmedabad): I have the privilege to follow immediately after the speech of Dr Swamy. I have one advantage than my other friends, that Dr. Swamy is never required to be taken seriously. Therefore, many of the things that he has said in the House, need hardly any answer. But since he has spoken as one of the leaders of an opposition party, I would like to reply to his main points.

The main points that he has made out are—that the country is fast losing its self-reliance, that in the matter of Tarapur, there has been a sell-out and that in the matter of IMF loan, we have surrendered our rights for ever.

So far as IMF loan is concerned, I think, a number of times, the matter has been discussed in this hon. House including in the no-confidence motion. The then hon. Finance Minister made it absolutely clear that in our commitment to the IMF there is nothing inconsistent with what is contained in the Constitution and in our manifesto to the people. Twice—once in the Lok Sabha and second time in the Rajya Sabha—our hon. Prime Minister made a categorical statement that in IMF loan there are no conditions attached. But they are still harping on the IMF loan. I think, it is a useless talk and it does not require any answer when we know where we are in the IMF.

Coming to the point that because of the IMF loan our debt will increase and our position will be bad, Dr. Swamy does not understand and appreciate the fact that in the matter of exploration of oil, the country is heading towards self-reliance. We have cut down our import of oil resources, the main reason being that we want to reduce our balance of payment deficit. Thanks to the attempts of the ONGC, today we are on the way to self-sufficiency. If I may give some figures of what we are going to produce, in 1982-83, as against our original target of 20 million, we are expecting to raise 20.95 million; in 1983-84, as against the original target of 21.3 million, we are going to raise 26.38 million and in 1984-85 we propose to reach 29.46 million, as against the present target of 21.6 million. I am sure, this will make the country self-sufficient in the matter of oil and save us foreign exchange to the tune of Rs 5,000 crores. So, the fears of the prophets of doom are going

[Shri Maganbhai Barot]

to be belied. There are many people who go to Swamis for getting hope and aspiration. But here we have in our midst a Swami, who is a prophet of doom. He says that we are going to be doomed. That is why, perhaps, he is not present here to hear the reply that his prophesy is not correct.

In making a reference to the visit of the Prime Minister to USA, he was not all alone. In fact, Shri Vajpayee was a little more vocal about it. I do not know whose opinion counts in such matters, but I have with me the opinion of at least one person who is not interested in the side of the Government or the opposition, and that is the Prime Minister of Japan. I am quoting from *The Hindustan Times* of 6th August 1982, according to which the Prime Minister of Japan welcomed the visit to USA by the Prime Minister of India:

"Speaking at the dinner, the Japanese Prime Minister welcomed the new turn in Indo-US relations after Mrs Gandhi's successive visit and said 'It is significant not only to India and the United States but also to the future of the whole world'.'

The newspaper further says:

"The Japanese Prime Minister praised Mrs. Gandhi's management of India's policy and economy and her 'outstanding wisdom and active performance as a leader of Asia and the world'."

It goes on:

"Mr Suzuki commended Mrs Gandhi's efforts to strengthen the non-aligned movement, for having better relations with China and Pakistan and extending strong support to the newly-emerging concept of regional co-operation among South Asian countries.

He said: 'All this, I believe, will make a great contribution to the strengthening of peace and stability of Asia and the world.' "

This is what the Japanese Prime Minister had to say about it.

Now I will quote some friends from the third world:- some of the magazines and some of the editors who have made some remarks about the Prime Minister's visit to the United States. I am referring to a quotation from the Special Report of Dewan Berindranath. who accompanied Mrs. Gandhi on her US tour. The report says:

"As Mohammed Hamadi, editor of The Third World Daily News, Washington told this reporter, 'It was refreshing to hear a Third World leader stand up and tell the Aemricans certain home truths on their face. Mrs Gandhi minced no words in exposing the hollow nature of the American policies on Palestine and Lebanon, and hitting them on their blatant support to Israel."

He quotes further:

"Secondly, through Mrs Gandhi's pronouncements on issues like the Zionist aggressors and support for the Palestinian's cause. India, emerged, as Maksood. the Arab League Ambassador to the UN, told me: 'Unquestioningly the most authentic, the most powerful and the most respected voice of the Third World'

This view was supported by Ahmed Budavi, the PLO observer to the UN, who told me in the course of a conversation, that 'India has once again established its position as being the conscience of the oppressed half of humannity'."

Sir, this is the answer to prove that we are the spokesmen of the oppressed half of humanity. That is the outcome of the visit of our Prime Minister of USSR.

AN HON. MEMBER: USSR or USA?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY: USSR.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT: Sir, Prof. Satyasadhan Chakraborty will hear every where USSR, even of something else is mentioned.

Sir, I am coming to the economic understanding and economic appreciation by no less a person than the one who is going to be the Governor of our Reserve Bank in the next few days.

In an interview given to the *Economic Times,* while considering all around the depression that is going on and the economic crisis that the world is passing through, Dr. Manmohan Singh said, and I quote from the *Economic Times* of 12th August 1982:

> "The world as a whole is in deep economic difficulties. There is growing uncertainty about import prices, exchange rate and availability of markets. And this has depressed not only growth rates, but also the growth of international trade of several countries. Taking all these factors into account, the performance of the Indian economy in the last two years can be viewed with considerable satisfaction."

Sir, we are not making a high speech about it, but this is the position.

Much more also is said about certain issues by some friends, especially about why they brought the No-confidence Motion. This is the third time in three years that the No-confidence Motion has been brought. On our side it is the record of the Congress Party that we supported only one No-confidence Motion and we supported it because No-confidence Motion is not a joke. On 11th July 1979 when we supported the No-confidence Motion, the Government that was sitting here called off the debate because as a result of the No-confidence Motion debate the Government had to go. But what are we watching today? Every time No-confidence Motion is brought, if I may say so, in comparison we see that it is done in a lesser degree than an adjournment motion. I say lesser degree because of an adjournment motion is admitted, at least the proceedings of the House are adjourned. Then nothing takes place except that that matter is discussed. Here, the whole House has completed its programme. Everything is over, Bills are over. So, what they have been successful in is to prolong the House for a day or two more which is costing the exchequer and the people of India merely because they want to make some speeches.

Mr. Samar Mukherjee was making a complaint when the Hon. Speaker said, 'Now, your time is over'. He said, 'I should be given more time'. Well, I would like to remind Mr. Mukherjee; 'you are the leader of the largest Party.' You know the other day in this House when the External Affairs Minister was making a statement, you said he cannot make it. We expected you, the leader of the largest group, to avail of the maximum time, but you surrendered it to the leader of a smallest group in this House and then you made a complaint that you had been given no time. If the time did not come to your rescue, it was got surrendered to him and it is not our fault to do that.

(*Interruptions*).

Mr. Atal Bihari Vajpayee made a grievance. Atalji speaks Hindi.

जो कि धारावाही कही जाती है । वे अपने आप कहे जाते हैं । इट इज डिफिकल्ट ट रिमेम्बर कि वे क्या कह रहे हैं ।

I would like to remind what his colleague said once. He said, two-and-a-half years have passed.

आधी जिन्दगी चली गयी है, अब क्या है ।

I want to just remind him what his colleague said about two-and-a-half years ago, on a No-confidence Motion in this House. It was Mr. George Fernandes participating in that famous debate where he supported the Government once and voted against it the next day.

In this piece, he said replying on behalf of the Government as the Industry Minister, and I quote—Mr. George Fernandes from the debate of July 12, 1979.

> "Sir, we have been in power for only 2 years and 3 months so far and we could not have shaken the Himalayas. We could not have done that."

They could not shake the Himalayas.

[Shri Maganbhai Barot]

That was two years and four months. This is two years and seven months. They could not shake the Himalayas but we are expected to shake the Himalayas. If we cannot, then Shri Atal Bihari Vajpayees comes and says, 'what have you done?' This is my humble submission. There are many points which need not be answered in the No-confidence Motion because they have been answered. Take the case of Bihar Press Bill. The hon. Home Minister more than once said that the matter is just within the frame-work of the State. The State Assembly has passed it. The Governnor is seized with it. There are consitutional lawyers like Shri Somnath Chatterjee. I ask him. I am also a small lawyer. I ask him to show me a single legal provision in the Constitution where between the federal arrangement; before the Bill goes to the Governor, he can be directed to do this and do that. Please show me that. It is always spoken about west Bengal—"Please do not interfere. This is interference in the federal structure and authority."

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: It has come to the Centre to seek (*Interruptions*).

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT: You are not the only man because you will speak as a lawyer.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: The Centre here has to direct the Governnor. It is in the concurrent list. It has to come to the Centre.

SHRI MAGANBHAI BAROT: I only want to say one thing—It should not be attempted to put that every act of the State is necessarily an omission of the Centre. It cannot be so implied. There are legal provisions. The Governor is seized with the matter. He has no alternative but to send it to the Assembly back, to refer to the President or decide the way he likes. The Government of India comes into the picture only when it comes to the President. But the difficulty with the Opposition is that they cannot distinguish between the Prime Minister and Shrimati Indira Gandhi as the leader of the Congress Party. What they want to ask from the Prime Minister may be within the right to be asked from the leader of the party. What I say is that you cannot raise the issues of the political parties in a debate. That is why our submission is that by raising the issues like this which are already debated, discussed and thrown out an attempt has been made to bring No-Confidence Motion.

We know the story of a village boy and the wolf. We all have heard it in the childhood. One fine morning he said that the wolf has come. Just as the Opposition every time says. People thought that there was something serious. They went to his rescue with sticks and swords. But when they went he said. "I was joking". No Confidence Motion has become a joke just as the joke of the village boy. They are how saying that this is a sword which we will fight with you. This sword is one which cannot cut the lady's finger. Thank God India has a Prime Minister a lady whose fingers you cannot cut. (*Interruptions*).

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Tridib Chaudhuri. Do not record anything.

SHRI TRIDIB CHAUDHURI (Berhampore): I was really not very much ready to be called upon to speak just now.

The real point about this Motion of No Confidence is not that it has been moved with any hope of its being carried or passed. It is really to register the protest of of the Opposition Parties and the people to the manner in which the things are being run in the country today. There is no doubt about the facts that the things are not what it is claimed by the Ruling Party to be on the face of it. I do not want to repeat the things that have been already stated here with regard to the economic situation.

There is no doubt the fact that but for the three years tenure of Janata Party rule, the country has been made under the rule of the Congress Party, and again the Congress Party has come into power for the last two years. They have been continuing the same line of policy which has brought the country to this present critical pass. Sir, the monopoly houses and the leading

business groups have flourished like anything. Every body knows that. Many reports like the Licensing Committee Report, Monopoly and Restrictive Trade Practices Commission Report and several reports and also the facts stated by the Govenment during Question Hour on various occasions have brought about the fact that the big monopoly houses have thrived and have been thriving. Their profits are mounting and I think, the common people particularly the landless and the working class, the landness peasants and the lower middle-classes people and other have been suffering like any thing. Their poverty is increasing day by day and these are known facts and uptil now this trend has not been reversed. Corruption in the country has not only been institutionalised but things have come to such a stage that one may be permitted to say that it has become almost nationalised. Every now and then, things come up in Parliament which reveal just a little of the enormous amount of corruption that is prevailing in the country today. The Kuo Oil deal case has been spoken about. The Thal Vaishet case has come up. But these are the big affairs. For every small thing, common citizens know that to get things done anywhere in the country—in the Government offices—they have to grease the palm of the officials concerned—big or small—and they are now reconciling themselves to that position. That is the situation so far as corruption is concerned. If this trend has to be reversed then the policies have to be changed radically. But I have no hope that this Government will be able to change its policies. That is why the parties of the Opposition have decided to bring this Motion of No-Confidence in order to register their protest once again.

With these words, I support the Motion.

15 hrs.

[SHRI HARINATHA MISRA *in the Chair*]

श्री चरण सिंह (बागपत) : सभापति जी मुझको यह मालूम हुआ है कि जब माननीय शुक्ला जी बोलने के लिये खड़े हुए थे, इत्तफाक से मैं चला गया था, तो उन्होंने मेरा जिक्र किया था किसी मामले में।........

(**व्यवधान**)....मैं अर्ज कर रहा था शुक्ला साहब ने यह फरमाया कि मैंने बहुगुणा जी को के० जी० बी० का एजेन्ट बतलाया था। यह बात गलत है। मुझसे यह बात 25 मार्च को जब मैं अस्पताल में बीमार था 1977 में, श्री मोरारजी देसाई मुझसे मशविरा करने के लिये गये थे कि 26 तारीख को शपथ लेना है मिनिस्ट्री को आपकी क्या राय है। तो उस बात के बीच उन्होंने ही खुद यह कहा था, जबकि बहुगुणा जी का जिक्र आया जो मेरे मुंह में बात रखी गई कि वह के० जी० बी० के एजेन्ट हैं, यह देसाई जी ने मुझ से कहा। और यही बात मैंने 29 सितम्बर को....

(**व्यवधान**)

अब उन्होंने सही कहा या गलत मुझे नहीं मालूम।....

कुछ माननीय सदस्य : कोई तहकीकात नहीं की ?

श्री चरण सिंह : पता नहीं उन्होंने कोई तहकीकात की या नहीं।...(**व्यवधान**) इधर-उधर जो लोग बैठे हुए हैं उन सबके हर प्रकार की भ्रष्टाचार की तहकीकात हो जाय, मैं तैयार हूं, सब तैयार हैं। मैंने हरगिज हरगिज यह बात नहीं कही।

जहां तक आज के अविश्वास के प्रश्न का ताल्लुक है......

सभापति महोदय : इससे तो समस्या और ज्यादा व्यापक एवं गंभीर हो गयी।

श्री चरण सिंह : मेरे कहने का मतलब यह है जो शोर मचाया गया और खुशी मनाई गई, तो मैं अर्ज करता हूं कि सारे मामले की तहकीकात हो जाए उधर से भी और यहां से लेकर वहां तक। मैं अपने आपको भी शामिल कर रहा हूं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : जनता ने फैसला दे दिया ।

श्री चरण सिंह : शोर मचाने से कोई काम नहीं बनता, ध्यान से मेरी बात सुनिये । मैं कोई ऐसी बात नहीं कहना चाहता जिससे आपको तकलीफ हो । मैं केवल नीतियों की बात करना चाहता हूं ।

दूसरी और तीसरी प्लान में प्लानिंग के 4 उद्देश्य रखे गये थे । पहला एकोनामिक डेवलपमेंट, गरीबी को मिटाना । दूसरा बेरोजगारी को न होने देना और जो है वह खत्म करना । तीसरा यह कि गरीब और अमीर का जो फर्क है, जो उस वक्त फर्क था उसको भी कम करना । गरीब और अमीर का फर्क बिल्कुल मिट जाए यह नामुमकिन बात है, लेकिन जितना कम किया जा सकता है उसको कम किया जाय । चौथा यह कि इस तरह की अर्थ-व्यवस्था हो, इकोनामी हो जिसमें डेमोक्रेटिक ट्रेंड और बिहेवियर अर्थात् जनतांत्रिक व्यवहार हम करने लगें और जनतांत्रिक प्रवृत्तियां मजबूत हों । यह चार उद्देश्य रखे गये थे । दूसरी और तीसरी योजना में । देखना है कि वह उद्देश्य कहां तक पूरे हुए ? मेरा विचार है कि वे उद्देश्य बिलकुल पूरे नहीं हुए ।

जहां तक गरीबी का ताल्लुक है अभी जो वर्ल्ड बैंक एटलस आई है उसको देखने से मालूम होता है कि दुनिया के 125 देश ऐसे हैं जिनकी 10 लाख से ज्यादा आबादी है और पर कैपिटा इन्कम के लिहाज से हमारा नम्बर 123 है । 1964-65 में हमारा नम्बर इन्हीं दुनिया के देशों में 85वां था । सन् 1973 में हमारा नम्बर 102 हुआ, बल्कि 102, 3, 4, श्रीलंका, पाकिस्तान और हिन्दुस्तान की एक ही इन्कम थी । आप 102 मान लीजिये । आठ नौ वर्ष में हमारा देश 17 पोजीशन नीचे गिरा ।

अभी 1979 के मुताल्लिक जो रिपोर्ट आई है, उससे पता लगता है कि आज हमारा नम्बर 102 से घटकर 123 हुआ है । यह हमारी आर्थिक प्रगति हुई है जबकि पाकिस्तान और बंगलादेश की आबादी की बढ़ने की रफ्तार हमसे ज्यादा है, उन्होंने अपनी पोजीशन को कायम रखा है, वही 103, 104 के आसपास है, या जो पोजीशन रही हो आज से 10 साल पहले । लेकिन हमारी पोजीशन बावजूद इस बात के कि हमारी पापूलेशन ग्रोथ जनसंख्या की वृद्धि की रफ्तार इन मुल्कों से कम है, हम आमदनी के लिहाज से नीचे गिरते चले गये, नीचे गिरते जा रहे हैं ।

माननीय प्रधान मंत्री ने एक बात 15 नवम्बर, 1980 को, हरीओम् मंडल एक संस्था है, उसका कोई उत्सव हो रहा था, उनको वहां व्याख्यान के लिये निमंत्रित किया गया था, या कोई और सरेमनी थी, उसमें उन्होंने कहा कि अपोजीशन कहती है कि देश बड़ा गरीब है, मुझे तो कोई गरीबी दीखती नहीं, सब पहले से अच्छा कपड़ा पहनते हैं, अच्छा खाते हैं, सबके चेहरे पर चमक है, लाली है, सब की आंखों में रोशनी है । यह आपने फरमाया । यह आपकी अपनी रीडिंग है कि देश में बड़ी मालदारी है । बाद में कुछ दिन बाद शायद कुछ लोगों ने आपसे कहा कि आपका बयान सही नहीं है, न लोग तन्दरुस्त हैं । आपने कहा कि गरीबी तो सभी देशों में है, अमेरिका में भी है, योरुप में भी है, वहां भी कुछ लोग गरीब हैं ।

सभापति महोदय, मैं आपके जरिये माननीय सदन के सदस्यों से अर्ज करना चाहता हूं कि गरीबी की परिभाषा हमारे यहां यह की गई है और सही की है प्लानिंग कमीशन ने कि जो आदमी मैनुअल वर्क करता है, अधिकतर जो गांव के रहने वाले लोग हैं, जब तक उनको 2400 कैलोरी रोजाना पोषण तत्व नहीं मिलेगा और जो लोग नान-मैनुअल वर्कर हैं, इन्टलेक्चुअल वर्क वगैरह करते हैं,

उनको 2100 कलोरी पोषण तत्व नहीं मिलेगा तो वह गयीब समझे जायेंगे, गयीबी की रेखा से नीचे समझे जायेंगे ।

1978 में हमारे यहां 52 परसेंट आदमी बिलो पावर्टी लाइन थे, उससे पहले 1972–73 में 48 परसेंट थे और अब 1981 के बजट मेंशन के दौरान प्लानिंग मिनिस्टर ने जो एक सवाल का जवाब दिया, उसके हिसाब से 68 करोड़ आदमी में से 38 करोड़ 40 लाख आदमी पावर्टी लाइन के नीचे हैं यानी 55 परसेंट । तब से अब तक कीमत बहुत बढ़ी हैं । जो सुविधा, खाने की वस्तु उस समय गरीब आदमी को हासिल हो सकती थी, वह आज नहीं हो सकती हैं ।

माननीय बहुगुणा जी ने 2, 3 चीजों का जिक्र किया, मैं उसमें जाना नहीं चाहता । मैं बिला खौफ तरदीद यह कहने के लिये तैयार हूं कि 66 परसेंट आदमी ऐसे बदकिस्मत हैं इस देश में आज, जिनको पोषक तत्व खाने को नहीं मिलता है । जो आधे पेट रात को सो जाते हैं ।

बच्चा भूख की वजह से रोता है, मां इस बात को जानती है, लेकिन खाने को नहीं दे सकती । अपनी झुंझल उतारने के लिये अपनी तकलीफ को दूर करने के लिये बच्चे को थपक कर सुलाना चाहती है । क्या आज इससे कोई इन्कार कर सकता है ? यह वाक्या है । आप पूर्वी यू० पी०, मध्य यू० पी० में जाइये वहां ज्यादा परसैंटेज पावर्टी लाइन से नीचे हैं । इसी तरह वेस्टर्न यू० पी०, हरयाणा और बिहार में जाकर देखिये, घरों में बहू-बेटियों, जवान बेटियों को देखिये, उनके पास सिवाय एक धोती के और कुछ नहीं है । घर में एक थाली है, एक बहिन खाना खा ले या कोई भी मेम्बर खा ले तो दूसरे के खाने के लिए थाली मांजनी होगी ।

1917 में चम्पारन में महात्मा गांधी गये थे, वहां से गुजरे तो इंडिगो प्लान्टर्स की हिन्दुस्तानी काश्तकारों के साथ ज्यादती हो रही थीं । उस स्थिति के अध्ययन के लिये महात्मा जी के साथ माता कस्तूरबा भी थीं । जिन गांवों में होकर वह गुजरीं, वहां मरद; स्त्री, बच्चे, बूढ़े सब इकट्ठे हुए कि कोई व्यक्ति हमारी दुर्दशा देखने के लिए आया है । महात्मा गांधी ने कस्तूरबा जी से कहा कि इनसे जाकर पूछो कि हम मान लेते हैं कि गरीबी है, लेकिन कपड़े मैले क्यों हैं, उन्हें धो तो सकते थे । माताजी ने महिलाओं से पूछा, लेकिन चुप । फिर पूछने पर भी उन्होंने संकोचवश जवाब नहीं दिया । बाद में उन्होंने बताया कि कैसे कपड़े धोयें, यही धोती है, जो पहने हुए हैं, जब तक यह फट न जाए, दूसरी न आ जाए, न नहा सकते हैं और न उसे धो कर सुखा सकते हैं । मुझे माफ करें, खास तौर से माननीया प्रधान मंत्री जी और उधर बैठने वाले माननीय सदस्यों से मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि बावजूद इस बात के कि 65 बरस इस बात को बीत गए हैं, आज भी बिल्कुल वही हालत है ।

आपने अखबारों में पढ़ा होगा—तीन कालम की सुर्खी है—कि पीपल आर ईटिंग ग्रास फार वांट आफ फूड । और हमारी प्रधानमंत्री जी को गरीबी नहीं दिखाई देती है । उनको ही नहीं, हममें से किसी को भी नहीं दिखाई देती है । हम तो दिल्ली में रहते हैं । दिल्ली की चकाचौंध में हमें कहां गरीबी दिखाई देती है । जिन घरों में या झोंपड़ियों में हम पैदा हुए थे, उन्हें हम भूल गए हैं और यहां आ कर रहने सहने का हमने दूसरा स्टाइल अख्तियार कर लिया है । गरीबी का बुरा हाल है । इसके मिटने का कोई सवाल ही नहीं है ।

बेरोजगारी के बारे में श्री बहुगुणा जी ने आंकड़े बताए थे । छः महीने पहले के गवर्नमेंट के आंकड़े हैं कि 1.80 करोड़ नौजवानों के नाम एम्प्लायमेंट एक्सचेंज के रजिस्टर में दर्ज हैं । मार्च 1977 में, जब जनता पार्टी ने चार्ज लिया था, 1.02 करोड़ नाम थे । इन

[श्री चरण सिंह]

चली गई है। न मैं आपको दोष देता हूं और न जनता पार्टी को, जिसके हाथ दो ढाई साल पावर रही। दोष है हमारी गलत पालिसी का। मुझे बताया गया है कि कई डाक्टरेट पास, पी एच डी, नौजवान हैं, जो चपरासी की नौकरी की तलाश में हैं, लेकिन वह भी उन्हें नहीं मिलती है। ऐसे पोस्ट-ग्रेजुएट लड़के हैं, जो रोजाना की मजदूरी पर 7 रूपए की उजरत पर काम करते हैं। दो दिन बाद एम्प्लायर कह देता है कि कल न आइएगा, हमें जरूरत नहीं है।

इसी सिलसिले में मैं एक और बात कहना चाहता हूं। जमींदारी का जिस तरह विनाश किया गया है, उसके रूरल सोसायटी को, हमारे देहात को, नुकसान हुआ है बजाए फायदे के। इसमें गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से लापरवाही हुई और जमींदारों को इजाजत दी गई गरीब आदमियों को बेदखल करने की। मार्जिनल फार्मर्ज, सब-मार्जिनल फार्मर्ज, स्माल फार्मर्ज डंडे के जोर से हांक दिए गए। उनके पास इसके सिवा कोई रास्ता नहीं रह गया सिवाय इसके मजदूरों की श्रेणी में अपने नाम लिखवा लें।

ज्यादा तफसील में न जा कर मैं कहना चाहता हूं कि 1951 में 70 परसेंट आदमी सीधे एग्रीकल्चर में लगे हुए थे। फिशरीज और एनिमल हसबेंड्री में 2 परसेंट लोग थे। उस वक्त सैंसन्स के मुताबिक उनमें से 58 किसान थे और 12, 13 खेतिहर मजदूर थे। 1961 में किसानों की तादाद घट कर 51 रह गई और मजदूर बढ़ कर 17 हो गए। इसके बाद 1971 में किसानों की तादाद और घट कर 43 रह गई, जबकि मजदूर 17 से बढ़ कर 27 हो गए। अभी 1981 की सेन्सस की पूरी रिपोर्ट नहीं आई है, लेकिन मालूम हुआ है कि इस वक्त 40 किसान हैं और 30 एग्रीकल्चरल मजदूर हैं। 40 किसानों में 55 परसेंट वे लोग हैं, जिनके पास ढाई एकड़ से कम जमीन है। अर्थात् 4 बीघे पुख्ता से कम जमीन है। उसको तो मजदूर रखने की जरूरत नहीं है। उसके घर की ही श्रम शक्ति को काम करने भर के लिए जमीन उनके पास नहीं है तो 40 में से निकल गए 55 प्रतिशत, 22 ऐसे किसानों को मजदूर की जरूरत नहीं है। कुल 18 को जरूरत है और उसमें भी सब को जरूरत नहीं है। जो स्माल फार्मर्स हैं या जिनके घर में जवान लड़के हैं काम करने के लिए उनको जरूरत नहीं है। तो अब ये 30 खेतिहर मजदूर कहां जाये ?

इसी तरह से जो दस्तकार हैं वह सब खत्म हो गए। अंग्रेजों ने हमारी सारी काटेज इंडस्ट्री को करीब करीब खत्म कर दिया था लगभग तीन चौथाई को। सन् 31 की सेन्सस रिपोर्ट यह कहती है कि 74 परसेंट जो आर्टिजन थे, दस्तकारी का काम करते थे वह धीरे-धीरे ऐग्रीकल्चर में चले गए, केवल 26 परसेंट अपने पेशे में रह गए। कोई लम्बी कहानी मैं नहीं कहना चाहता। अंग्रेजों ने हमारी इंडस्ट्री को नष्ट किया अपने उद्योगपतियों के हक में। मुझे अफसोस है के साथ कहना पड़ता है और तकलीफ के साथ कहना चाहता हू कि स्वराज्य होने के बादभी दस्तकारों के साथ वही हुआ जो अंग्रेजों ने किया था। हमारे नेताओं ने अपने चुनाव लड़ने के लिए यह किया जिसका नतीजा हुआ कि गांव के सभी दस्तकार अब खत्म हो गए। अंग्रेज अपने इंडस्ट्रियल लिस्ट्स के लिए लंकाशायर और और लिवरपूर को यहां से कच्चा माल ले जाते थे और पक्का माल वहां से बन कर यहां भेजते थे। जूट, काटन यह सब यहां से जाये और कपड़ा वहां से बनकर आए, इसके लिए यह सब कुछ किया जिसका नतीजा यह हुआ कि हमारे 74 परसेंट दस्तकार खत्म हो गए।

आप शायद यह कहेंगे कि आप ऐसी बात क्यों कहते हैं कि दस्तकार कांग्रेस के जमाने में या हिन्दुस्तान के आजाद होने के बाद खत्म हो गए ? तो यह कहने के लिए मेरे पास ठोस तथ्य हैं। सन् 55 में नेशनल सैम्पल सर्वे ने एक

सर्वे किया। वह इस नतीजे पर पहुंचे कि 1 करोड़ 2 लाख कारीगर गृह उद्योगों में लगे हुए हैं। गृह उद्योग की तारीफ उन्होंने यह की कि एक घर के चार से ज्यादा आदमी जिसमें न लगे हों। यह तो नेशनल सेंम्पल सर्वे के आंकड़े हैं। 1970-71 का जो सेन्सस हुआ उसमें गवर्नमेंट की तरफ से आदेश हुआ कि वह इसका भी हिसाब लगावें कि काटेज इंडस्ट्री या हाउस होल्ड इंडस्ट्री में पहले कितने आदमी हुए हैं। तो मालम हुआ 1 करोड़ 2 लाख में से 63 लाख ही रह गए। अगर कोई नया उद्योग न लगाते, वही लगे रहते तो 15 साल बाद 35-36 प्रतिशत जन सख्या बढ़ गई थी, तो वह 1 करोड़ 2 लाख की तादाद जो थी वह 38 लाख हो जाती। लेकिन 1 करोड़ 38 लाख की जगह रह गए 63 लाख। ये 75 लाख कहां गए? कोई जवाब है किसी के पास? ये सिर्फ इसलिए गए कि टाटा बिरला के कारखाने जो लगे उस काम को करने के लिए जो गरीब आदमी दस्तकार, छोटे-छोटे कस्बे या गांवों में काम कर रहे थे, वह सब मार्जिनल फामर्स, छोटे किसान, बहुत छोटे सब-मार्जिनल फामर्स, मजदूर या जो लोग दस्तकारी में लगे हुए थे वे सब शहरों की झोंपड़ी झुग्गियों में आ गए। उन्होने सुना हुआ था कि बड़े बड़े कारखानों में नौकरी मिलेगी। 33-34 परसेंट बम्बई में हैं, 33 परसेंट कलकत्ते में हैं, 26 परसेंट आप की दिल्ली में हैं, और 37 परसेंट कानपुर में है। यह पांच साल पहले के आंकडे हैं। जब आप बम्बई को देखें, जो 20 साल पहले बम्बई थी वह है अब ? एक तरफ पच्चीस पच्चीस खण्ड के महल बने हुए हैं औ उनके नीचे सड़कों पर गरीब आदमी पड़े हुए हैं। माननीया प्रधान मंत्री से खास तौर से कहना चाहता हू कि हमारी बहू बेटियों के बच्चे सड़कों पर पैदा हो रहे हैं, दिल्ली में भी, बम्बई में भी, कलकत्ते में भी उन महलों के साये में। किसी ने जानने की कोशिश की है कि ये लोग कहां से आए? ये झुग्गी झोपड़ी में रहने वाले कहां से आए? क्यों आए? व्याख्यान देने के लिए तो बहुत अच्छी बात है कि गरीबी मिट रही है, देश बड़ी तरक्की कर रहा है, टेक्नालाजी की इम्प्रूवमेंट होनी चाहिए। महात्मा गांधी की बात मानी नहीं गयी। महात्मा गांधी हजार वार सारी उमर यह कहते गए कि बड़ी फैक्ट्री उस काम को करने के लिए अगर होगी जो छोटे पैमाने पर हो सकते हैं तो इस का मतलब यह है कि आर्थिक सत्ता कुछ हाथों में केन्द्रित हो और हमारे लड़के, हमारे नौजवान, हमारे वर्कर्स, बेरोजगार हो जायेंगे। क्योंकि हमारी जनसंख्या ज्यादा है और नेचुरल रिसोर्सेज़ कम है। मत नकल करो अमेरिका और यूरोप की।

अमेरिका यूरोप में इंडस्ट्रियलाइजेशन कैसे हुआ। जहां प्राकृतिक साधन ज्यादा थे बमुकाबले जनसंख्या के उन देशों को उन्होंने अपना उपनिवेश बना लिया अथवा अपना दास। वहां से अपने बड़े उद्योगों के लिए कच्चा माल और कारखानों में काम करने वालों के लिये अन्न लाये। इस तरह से उन्होंने विकास किया। इन दोनों रास्तों में से हमारे लिये कोई रास्ता खुला हुआ नहीं है। अमेरिका की नकल कैसे करेंगे। 22 करोड़ आबादी और 36 कैसे लाख वर्ग मील जमीन उन के पास है और आपकी 68 करोड़ आबादी, बल्कि अब 70 करोड़ आबादी और 12 लाख वर्ग मील कुल जमीन आप के पास है। जमीन उन के पास हमारी से तिगुनी हैं। और आबादी आप की उन से तिगुनी है। उन के पास पर कैपिटा दस गुना जमीन हमारे मुकाबिले में है। तो आप उस की नकल नहीं कर सकते। इसलिये गांधी जी ने कहा था कि हम लोग अमेरिका की नकल नहीं कर सकते।

[श्री चरण सिंह]

रही पंडित जी की बात। ठीक है उन के बहुत से विचारों से मैं सहमत रहा हूं, बुजुर्ग थे, लीडर थे, आज इत्तफ़ाक से नहीं हैं। उन्होंने दूसरी योजना तैयार होते समय जनवरी 1955 में कहा था कि देश का इंडस्ट्रिअलाइजेशन होना चाहिये, बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज चाहिये। बड़ी इंडस्ट्री को लगाने के लिए उन से भी और बड़ी इंडस्ट्रीज चाहिये—दट अलोन मैंटर्स, नथिंग एल्स। नतीजा क्या हुआ? नतीजा यह हुआ कि.... (व्यवधान) नतीजा यह हुआ कि सन् 50-51 से लेकर 77-78 तक जो एग्रीकल्चरल वर्कर और नान-एग्रीकल्चरल वर्कर की आमदनी का अनुपात था वह 1 और पौने दो से 1 और पौने तीन हो गया। यानी जो फ़र्क एग्रीकल्चरल वर्कर और नान-एग्रीकल्चरल वर्कर की आमदनी में था वह ठीक डबल हो गया क्योंकि कृषि की उपेक्षा की गयी। रही फ़ैक्ट्री की बात कहा जाता है और यही सबूत दिया जाता है कि हमारे यहां तो यह भी चीज बन सकती है, वह भी बन सकती है। ठीक है बहुत अच्छी बात है। लेकिन सवाल यह है कि इस के नतीज क्या निकले हैं। नेशनल कौंसिल आफ़ अप्लाइड एकोनामिक रिसर्च की एक रिपोर्ट के अनुसार गांवों और शहर के लोगों की आमदनी के बारे में 1 निम्नतम 5 परसेंट से 10, 10 से 15, 15 से 20, 20 से 30 और 90 से 100 इस तरह से गांव और शहर वालों की आमदनी की एक रिपोर्ट उन्होंने दी। बहुत अच्छी रिपोर्ट थी। उस रिपोर्ट को देखने से पता पड़ता है कि सन् 1976 में गांवों के 1 करोड़ 55 लाख कुटुम्बों की जो निम्नतम 20 फ़ीसदी की श्रेणी में आते हैं सम्पत्ति जायदाद 10 अरब 94 करोड़ रुपये की और टाटा और बिरला की 11 अरब 8 करोड़ रुपया 11 अरब 70 करोड की थी। यह हमारा हिन्दुस्तान बना है। मैं फिर दोहराता हूं—1 करोड़ 55 लाख गांव के कुल परिवारों के कुल एसेटस हैं। 11 अरब, उन की झोंपड़ी और बकरी की कीमत लगा कर और इन दो हाउससेज की 11 अरब 8 करोड़ और 11 अरब 70 करोड़। तो जहां दो परिवारों की आमदनी और एसेसस 1 करोड़ 55 लाख परिवारों की आमदनी और एसेटस से इतना ज्यादा हो, एक तरफ दो करोड़ परिवारों की आमदनी 11 अरब और दूसरी तरफ टाटा के हाउसेज की 11 अरब 8 करोड़ और बिरला के हाउसेज की 11 अरब 70 करोड़ तो वहां गरीबी खत्म होने का सवाल क्या है?

अब हम कहते हैं कि हम बड़े समाजवादी हैं, अमेरिका पूंजीवादी मुल्क है। लेकिन मुझे एक टेबल मिला था जो मैंने अपनी किताब में शामिल कर लिया है। ताजा आंकड़े हमारी प्राइम मिनिस्टर आर्डर दें तो हमारे एकोनामिस्ट लोग मालूम कर लेगें, लेकिन जो मुझे पुराना टेबल मिला उस से यह मालूम हुआ कि उच्च श्रेणी 20 परसेंट आदमी जो यूनाइटेड स्टेट्स के थे उन की कुल इनकम 45.7 परसेंट थी सन् 50 में और वह 43 परसेंट रह गयी 59 में बीस परसेंट लोगों की

The share of the top 20 per cent of the people in national income in the United States went down from 45.7 per cent in 1950 to 43 per cent in 1959.

जो 45 परसेंट आमदनी थी वह घटी लेकिन यहां पर क्या हुआ? यहां पर उसके बिल्कुल उल्टा हुआ। यहां पर जो टाप के बीस परसेंट मालदार आदमी थे, जिनकी कुल आमदनी 42 परसेंट मालदार थी 1953 से 1957 के बीच में, वह बढ़कर 53 परसेंट हो गई 1967-68 में। इस तरह से जिसे अमरीका को रोज गालियां देते हैं, वहां पर बीस परसेंट आदमियों की आमदनी घटती है और इस देश में

टाप के बीस परसेंट लोगों की ग्रामदनी बढ़ जाती है। (व्यवधान) मुझे दस मिनट बोलने की ग्रौर इजाजत दीजिए।

ग्रब मैं ग्रौर ज्यादा तफ़सील में न जाते हुए यह कहना चाहूंगा कि पंडित नेहरू ने 1963 में ग्रपनी नीति की गलती को तस्लीम किया था। जब तक वे 2600 करोड़ रुपए का ग्रन्न बाहर से मंगवा चुके थे। पंडितजी ने 8 नवम्बर, 1963 को एन डी सी के सामने कहा था कि देश की तरक्की कृषि से होगी उद्योगीकरण से नहीं होगी जब 1955 से 1963 तक ग्रपने तजुर्बे से देख लिया तब जाकर उन्होंने राय बदली ग्रौर कृषि पर ज्यादा जोर दिया। उनकी स्पीच के एक्सट्रक्ट्स मेरे पास मौजूद हैं लेकिन वक्त की कमी के कारण उनको मैं नहीं पढ़ रहा हूं।

11 दिसम्बर को जब लोक सभा में प्लानिंग पर बहस हुई, जिसको श्री कामत ने इनीशिएट किया था, उसमें भी विरोधी पक्ष का तर्क यही था कि खरबों रुपये प्लानिंग में खर्च हो गये लेकिन लाखों करोड़ों लोग ग्रौर बेरोजगार हो गए, पर कैपिटा इनकम नहीं बढ़ी ग्रौर गरीब-ग्रमीर का फर्क बढ़ता ही रहा है। उस वक्त पंडितजी ने जो इस सम्बन्ध में कहा था वह रिकार्ड में मौजूद है :

"I begin to think more and more of Mahatma Gandhi's approach. I am entirely an admirer of the modern machine, and I want the best machinery and the best techniques, but taking things as they are in India, however rapidly we advance in the modern age, the fact remains that a large number of our people are not touched, and will not be touched by it for a considerable time. Some other method has to be evolved so that they become partners in production even though the production apparatus may not be efficient as compared to modern techniques."

पंडित जी ने उसी भाषण में यह भी कहा था कि मैं तस्लीम करता हूं कि मेरी गलती की वजह से प्लानिंग कमीशन की गल्ती की वजह से ऐसा हुग्रा। उनके भाषण के संबंध में मैंने ग्रपनी एक पुस्तक में इस प्रकार लिखा है :

He confessed in the Lok Sabha on December 11, 1963 that planning should not lead to heavy accummulation of wealth in the hands of a few, but that both the Government and the Planning Commission had failed to take effective measures to prevent accummulation. He promised to do so mare effectively in future, but then it was too late.

1964 में पंडित जी नहीं रहे लेकिन उनकी तीनों बातें क्लियर हो गई कि इस देश का डेवेलपमेंट होगा एग्रीकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन पर जोर देने से, किसानों के हाथ में पैसा ग्रायेगा, उनके पास क्रय शक्ति ग्रायेगी ग्रन्न ग्रादि के ग्रतिरिक्त उद्योगों से बने हुए सामान की मांग बढ़ेगी। जब ट्रांसपोर्ट इन्डस्ट्री, पावर ग्रौर रोड इत्यादि सब चीज़ पैदा हो जाएगी। मैं ग्रापकी इजाजत से ग्रर्ज करना चाहता हूं, जब कभी हम कृषि की बात करते हैं तो लोग कहते हैं कि चरण सिंह की पार्टी दखियानुसी लोगों की है, चाहते हैं कि सब लोग खेती करते रहे। नहीं— खेती की प्रोडक्शन पर इस लिए जोर दे रहे हैं कि नान-एग्रीकल्चर वर्कर्स की तादाद बढ़े ग्रौर किसान की तादाद घटे। जितना दूसरा पेशा करने वाले लोगों की तादाद बढ़ेगी, उतना ही देश मालदार होगा। लेकिन नान-एग्रीकल्चर डेवेलपमेन्ट तभी होगा, जब पहले एग्रीकल्चर डेवेलप हो जाए। दूसरे उद्योग धन्धों में पैदावार बढ़ती है, उस में वर्कर्स बढ़ जाते हैं ग्रौर कृषि में पैदावार बढ़ती है तो काम करने वाले कम होने चाहिएं। इसलिए हमारे देश का उद्देश्य यह होना चाहिए कि प्रोडक्शन की एकड़ बढ़े,

[श्री चरण सिंह]

लेकिन खेतों में काम करने वालों की तादाद प्रति एकड़ घटे और वह दूसरे पेशों में जायें, तभी देश मालदार होगा। देश तरक्की कर रहा है या नहीं कर रहा है, इस बारे में कोई अर्थशास्त्र की किताब पढ़ने की जरूरत नहीं है। सिर्फ यह देख लीजिए कि खेत पर काम करने वालों की प्रतिशत घट रही है या नहीं।

आज मुझे अफसोस के साथ कहना पड़ता है कि 72 प्रतिशत आदमी कृषि में लगे हुए हैं। 72 परसेंट सन 1951 में भी थे। मेरे पास आंकड़े हैं, मैं आपको पढ़ कर सुनाना चाहता हूं। सन् 1911 में 72.3 परसेंट और सन् 1921 में 73.1 परसेंट (व्यवधान)... आपको परेशानी हो रही है, तो सन् 51 पर आ जाता हूं... (व्यवधान)...
जवाब हो तो ठीक है, नहीं तो शर्म महसूस कीजिए... (व्यवधान).. आपकी कुछ समझ में आए या नहीं समझ में आए ... (व्यवधान)... हिन्दुस्तान में सन् 51 में 72 प्रतिशत आदमी कृषि में लगे हुए थे, सन् 61 में 71.94 परसेंट, सन् 1971 में 72.1 परसेंट। टाटा बिरला जैसे 38 बड़े-बड़े इन्डस्ट्रियलिस्ट बेशक अरबपति हो गए लेकिन एग्रीकल्चर के ऊपर जितनी जन संख्या थी, उतनी ही है। देश तब तक तरक्की नहीं करेगा जब तक कि खेतो की पैदावार बढ़ाने पर जोर न दिया जाए और बड़े उद्योगों पर रोक न लगाई जाए और जो चीज हाथ से छोटे पैमाने पर बन सकती है, उसको बड़े-बड़े कारखानों में न बनने दिया जाए।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं आपको धन्यवाद देता हूं कि आपने मुझे बोलने के लिए समय दिया और साथ ही साथ दोस्तों को भी कि उन्हों ने ध्यान से सुना।

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN (Satara): Mr. Chairman, Sir, I want to participate in the debate not to discuss any personalities, but policies. I was very glad that Choudhary Sahib has discussed certain matters about planning and planning priorities and about the question of poverty as such. I do not know from where he got this information about the Prime Minister saying that there is no poverty. Perhaps she was the first person in India in recent times to start the struggle against poverty. Nobody has said that there is no poverty. Choudhury Saheb gave very sentimental and very dark picture of poverty. May be in some sections poverty exists today. We do not deny that. It is not possible to claim that we have removed poverty, but we would certainly lie to make a claim in India that if for the first time it was the determination of any political party which wanted to commit itself to remove poverty, it was the Congress Party and no other political party.

Well, Choudhary Sahib is very fond of statistics and he has given some statistics and he has tried to build up a philosophy with which it is very difficult to agree. Well, poverty of course is there. Poverty is there, but how this poverty can be removed is certainly a very important question. Can we remove poverty by keeping the society as conventional as it was before. No Priority must be given for agriculture. Nobody denies that. And it is not very correct to say that Pandit Jawaharlalji only thought of agriculture in 1963. I mean, that it is something very wrong I have heard Chaudhary Charan Singh and Pandit Jawaharlal Nehru clashing with each other how to develop agriculture in Nagpur Congress when the cooperation movement was supposed to a very important instrument in developing agriculture. So, Pandit Jawaharlalji was for the development of agriculture from the very beginning. The concept of planning which emerged in India was that industry and agriculture should develop simultaneously. But there is also one point to be thought of: that is, if at all agricultural development has to take place, it can only take place along with industrial development. Without the industrial development there would not have been agricultural development that we see

in our country today. Therefore, we differ from Choudhary Saheb. (*Interruptions*)

श्री चरण सिंह : मैं आपकी इजाजत से एक बात पूछना चाहता हूं ।

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Let me complet. I am not quitting. I am not yielding. (*Interruptions*) I have heard you very patiently and now at least listen to me patienty.

I remember—I was also in the State Administration for a long time—that when the Second Plan was being prepared, I remember—once, I told this incident in the Planning Commission meeting when I was the Finance Minister—Pandit Jawharlalji came to Bombay when the Second Plan was under preparation and he gave his idea about what the Second Five Year Plan was about. And the idea was to give priority to the basic key industries in the Second Plan. That was the only thing that was to be considered, not at the cost of agriculture. But for the first time the emphasis was on the building of key industries in the country. I am also a rural man—I may not be as deep a rural man. as Choudhary Saheb is considered to be—but I am also a rural man. So, when he was discussing intimately with the Ministers, I was a junior minister, and I asked him the same question which Choudhary Charan Singh is raising today, that by laying emphasis on the key industries do you think that agriculture will suffer? He said, 'young man, you do not know. If you want to carry on your agriculture in a conventional manner you will remain where you are. But unless you take to the basic industries in this country and build them up, agriculture, itself will not be modernised. And he gave me explanation. If you want to have irrigation you must have big dams. If you want to have some sort of new energy to introduce in the agricultural life, you must have rural electrification. And this is exactly what has happened in the last 25 years. What is the use of merely quoting the figures, that there were so many agriculturists today. We quite agree that there is a heavy burden of manpower on the agricultural front. I am not denying that. There are difficulties also. The only way to remove that is to have industry, where prosperity can be ensured; that is one thing which can be accepted. Nobody has denied that improvement of small scale or village industries is a must. From the very beginning there has been emphasis on the village industries and the small scale industries. But naturally, when the basic industries were edveloped, at the present moment, today India can be counted as one country which can stand in difficult times of crisis. This is so only because we succeeded in building heavy industries in our country. It cannot be forgotten that this is the greatest contribution.

About concentration of wealth in few hands, it is not something new that Chaudhary Charan Singh is saying. The Congress itself, when they formed their Ten-Point programme in the 'sixties has said that—there are number of resolutions of the Congress on record to say that—the rich are becoming richer, and the poor are becoming poorer, because this was the basis on which the Congress people based their programme. The process is still on. I do not deny that. But the solution is not what you say. You have tried to describe the situation of poverty somewhat correctly. I am in agreement on that. But the solutions that you are suggesting are solutions meant for taking the country 200 years back. Therefore, those solutions are not acceptable to us. I tell you Choudhary Saheb that this fact is known to the Indian peasant more than you do. You try to take a position of being the spokesman of the agriculturists. We, in our own small way, can also claim that we have also representative character of the agriculturists. If you see the evidence of the eye in some of the villages at least, where irrigation water has reached, small industries have reached and fertiliser has reached, that there is a better situation. We do not mean to say that the poverty has gone. We also admit that the poverty is there and our main struggle will have to be against poverty. This is what the aim and objective of this party is. Shri Charan Singh is an elderly person. I have

[Shri Yeshwantrao Chavan]

great regards for him. Please do not take it amiss. We differ from you on certain basic issues... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI BHIKU RAM JAIN (Chandni Chowk): Difference is not allowed.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: Coming back to this No-Confidence Motion, I must express one view that the no confidence motion is a very serious business. It is a very important power in the hands of Parliament. It should not be so light-heartedly used the way it has been used. Really speaking, the present debate becomes, in a way, last day entertainment of the session. What was the point in bringing forward this No-Confidence Motion? Is there any seriousness about it? It is out of sheer political frustration that they have brought this Motion because they could not convince the House in the last five or six weeks on every issue that was brought and discussed here. The House decided the other way; the country decided the other way. Now, you have the satisfaction to come here and say 'get out.' Can you do that? Are you really serious about it? This is one of the biggest jokes. I know how to move a no confidence motion. It was done during the Janata Party rule. This is a very serious business. Please think about this. What is the purpose of moving a no-confidence motion? Are you in a position to challenge the basic policies of the Government. The economic policies, the foreign policy, internal policies, the external situation, have you anything to challenge in them?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Yes (*Interruptions*)

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am not yielding. About the internal problems I have told you that the plan process certainly has transformed the situation in India. We will have to take more and more radicial positions as we proceed further. Think about the socialist way of doing things. We can certainly solve the problems. We have yet to go a long way. The journey is long and difficult one. But the most important question that has to be asked today is: whether we are in the right direction or not. We are moving in the right direction. This is the basic thing that we have to take into account.

Talking about the economic or other internal policies, the whole world is besieged with inflationary problem, which has become a global problem. We are living in a world which is certainly convulsing with problems of inflation. The richest countries and the poorest countries are all involved in it. The richest countries can possibly get out of it. We have our own difficulties.

When this Government tried to find a way out of it, then there was a hullabaloo about the IMF Fund. Well, the IMF, the World Bank and similar institutions are meant for the prosperity of the world. This is one of the new types of contribution, of post-war period. This is something new and important. But I quite agree that we have to be very careful and cautious whenever we approach these bodies. I quite agree that many times we have to be careful about them. But when there is a necessity for it, merely, talking about self-reliance and also trying to give up whatever help is needed for the development of the country, if we deny ourselves of it, will not be self-reliance but self-starvation, which we cannot afford to do. We have to take care of our own sovereignty. This need not be told to us by A, B or C. This is being done by the party which led the movement for the freedom and independence of this country. It is quite aware of what is good and what is not good.

Turning to foreign policy, please tell us what is wrong with our foreign policy. You have not been able to find fault with it effectively. Certainly, you have repeated many points, but effectively you have not succeeded in finding fault with our foreign policy. If you look at the present situation of the world, it is full of

the atmosphere of war and peace. It is from this situation that this country has to be saved.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Bashirhat): War, not peace.

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: I am talking of the world situation. Since the war situation is there, peace must be taken care of. It is in that sense that I am talking. If we look at the world, apart from the two super-powers, the Big Powers, if you look at the policy of any country in the world today, in the third world, it is India's policy, which is completely correct, which is the best way to get out of the present dangerous situation. Today even the non-alignment movement is suffering from certain contradictions; there are certain pressures building up in the non-alignment movement, which need to be taken care of, and the country which can play some constructive role in the present situation, fortunately, is India, which has been accepted even by the non-aligned world.

When this is the position that India is occupying in the world today, you people come and say "Resign; we have no confidence in you." Who cares for your confidence? It is absolutely .... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: If this is the policy of the ruling party.. ....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI YESHWANTRAO CHAVAN: The most important thing that has to be taken note of today in Asian and African countries is......(*Interruptions*). The only country which has a stable Government and which has remained stable is India. There is no denying it. This is not what we say; this is what others tell us. So, India has a big role to play, and that is because India has built up the necessary resources in the industrial and agricultural sector. It has built up a position politically also in the world. So, we are in a situation to make a contribution to the peace not only in India but in the world. This is a fact which must not be denied.

Therefore, I say that the Motion of No-Confidence is not based on any major policy issue. Merely because you do not like a person, because you do not like Mrs. Gandhi, that does not meat that you have the right to bring a No-Confidence Motion. This is some sort of obsession against a personality ......(*Interruptions*) I am not like that. I take a general balanced view of the matter and I feel that she is giving the right leadership to the country. That is why I am supporting her ....(*Interruptions*) I do not want to reply to all the interruptions ..(*Interruptions*) I do not want to make any long speech. The points that Shri Choudhari made certainly prove our case that the planning process that has functioned for the last 30 years has saved India and put her in the right direction and that the No-Confidence Motion is an absolutely superficial thing, which should be thrown out.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA (Basirhat): Mr. Chairman, one notable feature of today's debate, as far as the Government side is concerned, seems to be that they are fielding a number of former Ministers, who lost their jobs for some reason or the other. They appear to be on probation today. I have no objection to that and I suppose in due course some of the non-probationary Ministers will also speak.

Sir, I have to reply to one point which was raised here by my friend, Mr. Gadgil. (*Interruptions*) Mr. Gadgil, who is, I know, quite a well-studied man, should not have made an erroneous reference, a comparison between the food production performance of India and the Soviet Union. The Prime Minister is going there very soon. If she thinks that what he has said is correct or what I am going to say is correct, she better seek a clarification from the Soviet leaders when she meets them.

President Brezhnev....

(*Interruptions*)

एक माननीय सदस्य : उससे क्या लगा ?

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त : लगा यह—

सभापति महोदय : आप अपनी बात कहिए——

श्री इन्द्रजीत गुप्त : वह क्यों बोलें ?

सभापति महोदय : इधर उधर से जो पूछा जाए उस में आप मत उलझें । आपका ही समय बरबाद होगा ।

15.54 hrs.

[MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER *in the Chair.*]

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Sir, the final figures show that while India has produced 131 million tonnes—definitely the performance of which we are all proud considering where we were a few years ago, a production of 131 million tonnes for a population of 68 crores—may be 70 crores or 68 crores—the official report of President Brezhnev submitted to the recent Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union which I hope is studied by some Ministers at least, claims that on an average, for the last five years, every year they have been producing 205 million tonnes of foodgrains (*Interruptions*) for a population of 26 crores of people. (*Interruptions*).

आपको क्यों रंज हो रहा है ? आप मदद के लिए क्यों दौड़ रहे हैं ?

The correct thing would have been done if he had chosen to do so, to work out and compare the per capita consumption and...

AN HON. MEMBER: Availability.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Availability of course. What is the use of saying—we have produced 131 million tonnes when your own Government says that nearly 50 per cent of our people have gone below the poverty line which means they are not getting enough to eat, whereas we all know that in those countries their habits are different. People do not live only on foodgrains. They are eating high proteins. In addition to foodgrains they are eating fish, meat and milk products and all these things which are available to them. This kind of comparison is invdious comparison and the imports that they are making, Mr. Gadgil, you should know that the bulk of the imports that are made of grains are for purposes of cattle fodder. Maize is imported to feed cattle in the Soviet Union and not for human beings. You should know that. (*Interruptions*).

It is all right. If you want to prove that you are much better than the people of the Soviet Union, you are welcome to boast about it because it will be publically propagated throughout the world. No doubt our dear Prime Minister will go to Moscow soon. She can have the benefit of exchange of views and figures with them. But since Shri Gadgil chose to make this remark, I had to reply to it because it is not correct. (*Interruptions*).

Secondly, it is our contention, much of the labour of the Members would have been saved if only Parliament had been permitted, as we had been demanding many times that the Plan, at least the Sixth Five Year lan, about which so many references are being made and different interpretations given should have at least been discussed in this House as the Plan either at the draft stage or even after it was finalised by the National Development Council. This is the first time in my experience—I have also been here since 1960 this is the first time in my experience that parliament was never enabled to discuss and debate a Five Year Plan which usually used to be done at the draft stage so that the Government, Planning Commission, National Development Council, can benefit from the views expressed here. But this time, it seems, time could not be found and now this debate cannot be a substitue for the debate unfortunately. In our opinion the main fountain head of corruption in this country and the main fountain head for the aggravation of the high prices is black money circulation in our economy. Of this—vast amount of black money. only a fringe of it, only a tip of the iceberg has been touched or sought to be

touched by Shri Venkataraman when he was the Finance Minister with his wonderful bearer bond scheme which was to attempt to convert black money into white money and to liberate black money operators from any penalty. We all know about that. But it does not mean that if any black money operator surrenders a small part of black money in exchange for bonds, it does not mean that he ceases to be a black money operator. A major portion of his ill gotten gains he will never reveal and he will continue his old nefarious practices. That is what is going on now. Shri Venkataraman may be pleased that he managed to get a little bit of money out of that. But that cannot touch the problem of black money which in thousands of crores of rupees is circulating in economy. As long as that famous parallel economy remains, neither corruption, nor aggravation of high prices nor an artificial scarcity in the market can be controlled. The reason I want to indict this Government is that they are absolutely at the mercy of this black money. They are not prepared and they cannot—by their very character and nature—they cannot wage a really consistent and bold struggle against this black money and the black money operators. Therefore, Sir, may I just mention, just to give a little inkling of the things which have come to light recently, which in my opinion requires much more serious investigation and further enquiry.

16 hrs.

Now, about the Kuo Oil deal which was discussed here, many questions were left unanswered. I want to know from the Government, when they reply officially, whether they have got any serious intention of following up the investigation into many of the questions which were raised and which were not replied to. For example, it has been stated publicly in the Press—by, I think, Mr. Arun Shourie himself, whose investigative capability unearthed the real thing, for the first time—he has stated that this Kuo Oil Company situated in Hongkong has a paid up capital of $150 I do not know, if it is true or not. But it has not been contradicted by anybody from the Government side. This Kuo Oil Company situated in Hongkong, according to Mr. Shourie, has a total paid up capital of $ 150. That means, it is a sign board and nothing else—maybe, it was a cover only for that company. Here, the deal was made through the agent, Monark Ltd., which, it was alleged, never dealt with oil at all. It was dealing with bicycle spare parts and sports goods. I want to know why the Government agencies, and on what considerations, placed such a big order with a company of this type, if a company is not viable and has no experience in the oil business. This is the first oil contract which was carried out by the Kuo Oil Company and probably, it will be the last. So, I want to challenge the responsibility of the Government which placed an order with this type of shady company and thereby endangered the futfilment of a contract of this size which was very important, at that time.

16.02 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

I want to know whether any serious enquiry would be held into these allegations. If they were not correct, you should deny them. Otherwise, one cannot but get the suspicion that something very shady was going on and on other consideration rather than the actual viability of the transactions.

Secondly, in the Kuo Oil case, according to the Committee on Public Undertakings, there might have been losses of 9 or 10 crores of rupees to the Government. But there has come to light—another case where there have been losses of Rs. 27 crores. Unfortunately, it does not seem to have attracted that much attention. It came to light in the other House during Questions and Answers. it deals with Birlas, one of the biggest monopoly business houses in the country and that is why, nobody wants to talk too much about it. People are not keen to talk about Birlas and Tatas. Why? I do not know what is the consideration. In that House, it has come to light, thanks to some information given by the Minister while replying to the Question, that the Hindustan Aluminium Company of Birla, known as HINDALCO, deliberately defaulted to a payment of Rs. 27 crores which it was required by law to pay into the Aluminium Regulation Account. There is an Aluminium Regulation Account where companies whose

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

retention price was lower than the sale price or higher than the sale price, are either to deposit the amount in the Account or allowed to withdraw the money from the Account. In the scheme, HINDALCO was to pay an amount of Rs. 27 crores into this Aluminium Regulation Account. They have refused to pay it so far. The Minister, in the other House, while replying to a Question, said, "the entire pricing scheme is in jeopardy because of the non-cooperation of HINDALCA."

And then, there is a Judge of the Court also whom I do not want to name because if I name him, they will object. The hon. Judge of the High Court in a case, in a petition, on this matter gave an oral judgment, an oral order, in February, 1981. It is now August, 1982. No written judgment has come so far and the Government pleaded that they could not appeal against it because there is no written judgment. The Government has not cared to move the Supreme Court to give any directive to the Judge of the Calcutta High Court.

I remember, in an attempt to scotch the elections in West Bengal, the Supreme Court gave some directive to the West Bengal High Court in Calcutta. But here where Rs. 27 crores are involved, the Government has done nothing. It has neither gone in appeal, nor it has moved the Supreme Court, nor it has enquired into the suspicious conduct of that judge.

THE MINISTER OF LAW, JUSTICE AND COMPANY AFFAIRS (SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL): It has gone in appeal; the appeal is fixed for hearing.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Maybe, after it was raised in the Rajya Sabha.

SHRI JAGAN NATH KAUSHAL: Earlier.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: So, we would like to know what are the considerations on which these things happened. We know who the Birlas are. We know what is the relation between this Government and such business houses.

One more instance I will give. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee is here. I think, he knows the case very well. The Government has now decided that one of the big international, multinational companies who operate in this country also, that is, Hindustan Lever which is a branch of Unilever will be permitted to retain 51 per cent of foreign equity holding, whereas, you know, under the Foreign Exchange Regulation Act, these companies are required to reduce their foreign holding to 40 per cent. 51 per cent foreign holding has been granted to Hindustan Lever. Several Questions were tabled in this House and in the other House. The replies given, I must say, are master-pieces of evasion.

As far as I am able to make out the Government are trying to justify this action which means that this Company will be able to remit profits abroad on a big scale. They are trying to justify this on three grounds. None of them holds water. One is that this Company has a very good export performance and, therefore, some leniency should be shown to it. About its export performance. I have got here the house magazine of this Company. They publish a house magazine called Unilever Magazine from England. There, they have written the following—I quote:

> "The Company has not yet started selling coals to Newcastle, but Hindustan Lever Export has not stopped far short of that point. Footballs and cricket bats come pouring into U.K. from India. At first, the staple exports were the products of Hindustan Lever but by now the Company has set up a roaring trade in third party goods. Last year, 200,000 pairs of sandals reached the British market. Thanks to Hindustan Lever Export, and so on."

They have described here the mechanism —I wish you had allowed me to quote further; it is very interesting—by which this Company is buying up goods in this country manufactured by other people, putting their stamp on it and exporting

those things apart from their soaps and all that. For this performance, they are being allowed 51 per cent equity holding.

Another reason put forward is that they are operating in the core sector. The core sector in this case means soaps and detergents. The Government says that they are not giving them any further additional capacity to manufacture soaps. But I found that there is no reason to give additional capacity because they already have been given unlimited capacity. There is no ceiling put on the capacity given to Hindustan Lever for the manufacture of even laundry soaps which were supposed to be exclusively in the sphere of small-scale industry.

Then, it is said that they have got high technology. I found out what it is. In the manufacture of soap, they are using a certain proportion of non-edible oils instead of edible oils. That is what they claim. I do not know whether the Government has any machinery for actually monitoring or checking how much edible or non-edible oil they are using. Here one of the giant companies in the world has been permitted to keep 51 per cent of foreign equity holding. All these instances which I am giving are examples of the new change, the new direction, the shift in the economic and industrial policies of this Government, which are completely in tune with the top business houses, the foreign multi-nationals, even at the cost of small-scale industry in this country.

I believe that the late Sanjay Gandhi had inaugurated or started an organisation, known as the National Alliance of Young Entrepreneurs. For a long time, nothing was heard about the activities of that Body. Recently, I found that that Body, the National Alliance of Young Entrepreneurs, started by Shri Sanjay Gandhi, has issued two statements in the press saying, even they are having to say, that if MRTP companies and FERA companies are going to be given all these unrestricted facilities and concessions which the Government is giving, then, medium scale and small-scale industry might as well fold up.

This is the direction of your growth now. I wish the policy discussion which so many people talked about on the Plan and on the economic policy could really have been held, but it has not been held.

All these things are being done apart from fulfilling the conditionalities of the IMF. I have got Mr. Pranab Mukherjee's letter which is there in the library. You can read it, if you like. It is the letter written to the Managing Director of the Internaional Monetary Fund on the 8th June. If one studies this document, one finds all the clues there as to why these things are happening, why Birlas are let off even when they violate the law, and why Hindustan Lever is being given these concessions.

(*Interruptions*)

In this letter, without quoting it because there is no time, you will find the whole philosophy of liberalisation of imports spelt out and I want to warn the Government because they are putting their feet into a trap. The trap is these Western powers, the developed countries want you to liberalise you imports so that you have to import more from outside. But there is no corresponding facility given to us to step up our exports to their markets. The whole game behind this is "Force these countries like India to import more but on the plea of recession in their own markets, on the plea of protectionism in their own markets, don't allow them to export into their own markets."

May I know how will you deal with this deficit? According to this course that we are following, the huge trade deficit which is already nearly Rs. 6,000 crores in one year, is going to increase more. This is a deliberate move against the developing countries and we are pushed into it. This whole loan is justified on the ground that it will help us to bridge the trade deficit. I am saying that the conditionalities of the loan will not help you to bridge the deficit but it will go on expanding and increasing the deficit and ultimately the debt obligation by 1983 and more so by 1985, will reach such a dimension—other Members have referred to it—that there is no possibility of being able to repay those

[Shri Indrajit Gupta]

debts. We will sink much deeper into the morass and, that is why we are saying that you will be forced to a position where we will be sacrificing our economic sovereignty. Unless you cry halt, and you have still got time to cry halt. But I do not know whether the Government is trying to do so. The path you are following means that you want hard curreny to pay off your debts. You cannot be satisfied with expanding trade with the socialist countries because you do not get hard currency or dollars there. That is all paid for in rupees. Suppose the trade with the Socialist countries has also to be financed with hard currency, where would we have been today? It is a big relief wherever we have got, that rupee trade is carried on there but having got that comfortable cushion on one side, the Government goes on headlong plunging deeper and deeper into this morass of the IMF and the World Bank although it will land us ultimately in a terrible catastrophe.

MR. SPEAKER: Please wind up.

AN HON. MEMBER: Wind up—Government or speech?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: About the Bombay textile strike, I have only one word to say because I have already maintained that, in these matters where the working class is concerned, there is no basic difference in outlook between our friends on both sides. I read the day before yesterday that Mr. Morarji Desai in Bombay, in some meeting of his own Party, was heckled by his own Party members because he was asked a question, 'What is your view about this prolonged strike in Bombay?' and it is reported in the press that Mr. Morarji Desai said, 'If I had been in power, I would have suppressed the strike immediately, I would have tired out the workers and seen that the strike fizzled out'. Those are exactly the tactics which this Government is following—trying to tire them out. When you cross swords with the former Janata Party people, please also spell out the things in which you are willing to embrace them also. That is where the working class and the poor people are concerned.

Under the revised 20-Point Programme, it has been assured that land reforms, that is, land distribution, will be completed by 1983 or 1985—I do not remember that. But the figures show that, under the Land Ceiling Acts which they have refused, of course, to put under the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution so that they could not be challenged in the courts—it has been left open—40 lakh acres of land roughly have been declared surplus and out of that, 24 lakh acres only have been taken actual possession of and 16 lakh acres have actually been distributed out of 40 lakh acres. 12 lakh acres are lying involved in litigation in courts because this Government, which is so soft towards big land-owners, persistently refuses to put these Land Ceiling Acts under the protection of the Ninth Schedule of the Constitution. So, after 1985, they will say that they have completed land reforms, there is nothing left to do now. But the reality of the situation is that the bulk of this land which has been declared surplus is neither within your possession nor has it been distributed nor can it be distributed because it is all locked up in litigation in courts. What do you propose to do about it?

Finally yesterday in her speech from the Red Fort ramparts—according to the speech I read in the papers; I could not hear on the radio because I was not here—the Prime Minister has, in my opinion quite correctly, identified as one of the main threats and menaces to the country at the moment the growth of casteism, communalism and various types of disruptive movements in the name of religion, and so on. I could not agree with her more. But simply identifying that problem does not absolve the ruling Party and the Government of its responsibility. What is she doing to tackle this problem? There, she has not said anything. I would like to know this; for example, in Punjab, the whole thing which has come up....

MR. SPEAKER: Please wind up.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: If you go to Punjab, Sir—it is your own State; you must be going there much more than I do —everybody talks openly about which are

the forces which were responsible for the growth of this Bhindrawale phenomenon. Is it not a fact that some Ministers in the Central Government—I do not want to name them—were the people who were actively colluding with and helping Bhindrawale for other motives? Is it not a fact that, when Bhindrawale entered the Delhi city with his armed followers openly brandishing their weapons, at least two Ministers—I do not want to name them— have gone and touched the feet of Bhindrawale, taken the dust from his feet? (*Interruptions*). How are you going to fight these things if you do not put your own house in order?

In Phulwari Sharief, a riot took place; it is very important because it is the centre of Muslim personal law the Imarat-i-Sharia is located in Phulwari Sharief. I wish to point out one thing. So many eye-witness reports have come that the police did nothing, took no action, were totally inactive, to suppress the people who were instigating these riots and distrurbances; people were killed and all that.

The same thing can be said about the atrocities being committed on the Harijans.

I wish to say that this Government, simply by talking about these problems, is trying to wash its hands off the responsibility of taking firm action against these communal elements and caste elements which it refuses to do.

Some of these people actively colluded with them. Therefore, we wish to indict them on this ground and on the ground of economic policy which is going completely into the hands of foreign multinationals, foreign agencies and big businesses like the Birlas.

THE MINISTER OF FINANCE (SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE): The ritual of no confidence comes up in almost every session and the justification given by some is that it provides an opportunity to talk with the Prime Minister and to others, to have a discussion on the economic policy because there is no time for discussing the substantive issue—I do not know which is correct and after hearing the speeches made by the Members of the Opposition, if I could make out, one major point on policy matters is with regard to lack of direction in the economy. The mover of the resolution said that the industrial policy, the econmic policy and the import policies are designed so as to surrender the economic interests the country to the multi-nationals and to the big monopoly houses. I would not like to take much time of the House in regard to the import policy. I would simply request the mover of the resolution just to have the import policy of 1977-78 and the import policy of 1980-81 and to make some home work and come out with the areas where there have been a major change in the policy so far as the import policy is concerned. I think the term 'liberalised import policy' was coined by them and not by us, in 1977-78 and even they went to the extent of having the cover of the import policy book changed from red to green. Earlier it was known as the red book when the Janata Party government came, they changed it to give the signal that they would not like to have a restrictive import policy but a liberalised import policy....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: So you are following that?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We are not following that.

Therefore, I am suggesting—in the import policy of 1980-81 you identify the items which have been taken out from the Open General Licence, how many and identify the major thrust which it has given to the imports. It is of no use using certain phrases days in and day out.'

You are saying 'surrender to multinationals and foreign companies. What is the share of foreign investment in this country? Only last Friday I gave the figures. Out of Rs. 60.000 crores of total investment in the private sector, the quantum of foreign investment is Rs. 2500 crores. I think this figure is not unknown to the former Finance Minister ,the mover of the resolution of no confidence. In terms of percentage it comes to 2.5.

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee]

Then there is 'lack of direction'. The allegation is that there is a lack of direction and that we are deviating from the path of self-reliance. What are the indications? If the production of coal increases by 9 per cent, if power generation increases by 10 per cent, if cement production increases by 17 per cent, if petroleum production increases—I am not talking about the year 1980-81 when it went up by 40 per cent—by more than 17 per cent and in one year, 1981-82 alone if we saved nearly Rs. 370 crores in importing petroleum and petroleum products, is it a policy of going away and giving up self-reliance?

With regard to public sector undertakings, I am sorry to quote the figures to remind the mover of the resolution who was also a Minister in the erstwhile Government, for the first time in 1976-77 when they came to power the public sector undertakings which were 149 in number earned a net profit of Rs. 183.89 crores and, thereafter. in 1977-78, the loss was Rs. 1.07 crores; in 1978-79, it was Rs. 14.09 crores; in 1979-80, it was Rs. 74.29 crores. In 1980-81, the same trend continued but, in 1981-82, at least, it has earned a net profit of Rs. 4.670 crores. Is it our going back from salf-reliance?

Of the massive investment of Rs. 97.500 crores in public sector, nearly 25 per cent is in agriculture. I am quoting certain figures for the benefit of the hon. Members to indicate what are the major investments which we are making and what are the areas where we are going back from this self-reliance? If we can build up industrial development, if we can produce more in the public sector and if we can use appropriate technology, is it in the direction that we are giving up self-reliance? Is it in the direction that we are surrenderring the economy to the multinationals?

Day in and day out, it has been talked about that certain concessions have been given in the new industrial policy.

What are those concessions? In 34 selected industries, they can have automatic increase in production. Even in marked for the small scale industries, no automatic expansion will be applicable. The allegation has been made that even the Industrial Development and Regulation Act is violated. I would like to mention this particular case of which he is so familiar. I know of one case in which they tried to do something but they could not do it because of the difference of opinion. But, there is one basic point

If you find that the capacity has been created in the industry, you require the production there in. Are you going to penalise for the extra production or are you going to regularise it? What has been suggested in the new Industrial policy Resolution is this. The areas where you want production are not earmarked for the smallscale sectors. If a capacity has been created, it is not that somebody nowadays invests money from his own pocket. Either he gets the working capital from the bank or he may get a term loan from the financial institutions or he gets it by raising capital in the market. So, what is the point in arguing that you stop the investment or you do not give any licence? Either you regulate or you restrict it. That we are doing. Therefore, where is the area that we are giving up? Surrender to the foreign monopoly"-this is your phrase—or there is conditionality in the IMF agreement. Why are we resorting to this? Who is responsible for that? Is this Government responsible? When we left—I am repeating it and I have repeated it on a number of times—office for the first time in this country, we left a modest surplus in the international trade account—Rs. 72 crores—and, when we came back, you left us with a net deficit of more than Rs. 2,000 crores. What are you going to do? Are you going to argue again that we stop import? What is our total import? Our total import was from 14 to 15 million tonnes and that is what we are going to do if the situation arises. The petrol bill was roughly—the hon. Mover of this Resolution knows much better than me because he was a Minister in charge of Petroleum Products—was about Rs. 17 hundred crores. It had increased threefold. It is not because of

you or in spite of you. What are you going to do? Are you going to create a situation and there will be no import? If you were to import from where are you going to earn foreign exchange? If you cannot make a medium-adjustment, then the entire arrangement with the IMF is to have medium-adjustment to overcome this crisis so that we can build up our resources, we can augmant our export effort and we can increase the remittances and invisibles. And at the same time, reduce our dependence on import. Nearly 65 per cent of our export earnings are being spent on four items, that is, petroleum and petroleum products, non-ferrous metals and to some extent edible oil. And we have taken certain steps. Addition of three million tonnes of steel during this decade at Vizag and in Orissa, creation of 800,000 tonnes of aluminium and aluminium products in the aluminium factory in Orissa, crash programme for the production of edible oil etc. are directed to reduce our dependence on imports Therefore, I am unable to understand what are the areas in which the mover of the resolution and other hon. Members feel that we are deviating from the path to which we are wedded.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: How will you pay back?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We can pay back. In this year itself, we are going to reduce our petrol bill by Rs. 370 crores. This is really a problem. I have admitted it myself that we cannot allow anybody to have any amount of loans. It must be tied with a specific project and we shall see that the project is implemented meticulously so that we are in a position to pay back and the debt burden does not become unbearable. I do agree with it.

Another point with which Shri Bahuguna started is a little surprising to me. He came to the conclusion that there are transfers of resources from the banking sector in the north-eastern region. I do not know wherefrom he got the figures.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: RBI.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: And this is also more intriguing that a former Finance Minister of the country is simply carried away by a figure of credit deposit ratio, completely forgetting that there is an element which is known as investment. Nearly, one-third of the total bank deposit is today advanced in the form of Government securities in the investment. Therefore how can you completely forget it? You have to take deposit credit plus investment and determine the ratio of the credit deposit not excluding investment, but including invesment In the north-eastern region alone, I have checked up the figure. Out of 220 crores of advances, nearly 141 crores was invested.

Then, there is a second point which is well known. So far as Assam is concerned, a part of the north-eastern region, a sizeable amount is not shown in Assam because those moneys are drawn in most of the tea gardens, and they have their headquarters in Calcutta. Therefore, those figures do not appear in Assam though the money is ploughed back in the tea gardens in Assam. The figures are shown in Calcutta in the eastern region, not in the north-eastern region. In Assam there is a sizeable investment in tea. If you take all this into account, there is no question of having resource transfer.

Then, the hon. Member asked what we were going to do about the new structure, so far as the banking sector is concerned. What was the position just before nationalisation of banks thirteen years ago? The total number of bank branches were 8368. Today, the number is more than 38000. The total deposit was just six to seven thousand crores, today it is more than forty thousand crores, and a sizeable amount of money is being injected. It is nobody's case that we have been able to take care of the rural economy entirely, it is nobody's case that the entire rural economy is served by the banking sector, but the point from which you started just thirteen years ago, the position is well known to the hon. Member, what was the situation before nationalisation, and from the day of nationalisation till today, in the 13 year, that what we have

[Shri Pranab Mukherjee]

been able to do and what the banking sector has been able to perform, is not insignificant.

Then coming to the areas of investment and economic development, the ratio is known to you. What was the general growth and under what circumstances you left and at that time you also shared power with us. And from there in 1979-80 we had growth of 4.1 per cent; in 1980 we had eight and odd per cent; and on the top of that when the base is reasonably high, in the first quarter of 1982-83, we are having an industrial growth of seven and odd per cent. If you look at the investment climate, perhaps for the first time in this country in 1981-82, capital raised from the primary market, the number of companies which was just 97 in 1976-77 has increased to 343 and the amount which was just 45.9 per cent crores has increased to 452.4 crores in the capital market. So, how has it been going down? And it is not foreign investment, it is not multi-national companies, it is not the FERA companies alone. Till today, one third of the total industrial production is coming from the small-scale sector and medium scale sector and it is being maintained. It is not the fact that small scale, cottage and village industries have been completly given a go-by. They are being maintained. They are supported, they are strengthened institutionally and they are being provided with the expertise.

Another point has been raised-and I was really surprised when Mr. Samar Mukherjee went to the extent of saying that there is a tremendous recession in the economy and that there is stock-piling. I don't know whether the Chairman of the FICCI could have put forward this argument more vehemently and more cogently. This is the argument that they are saying that there is recession in the economy and we are strongly refuting it and we are refuting it very correctly. We have correctly said that there is no recession. But what is the situation? Take for instance the commercial vehicle. If I want to have a commercial vehicle, a situation was created that I shall have to stand in queue for two years and after two years my turn will come and I get commercial vehicle. And if today a situation has been created where if I go and deposit money to get a commercial vehicle, I am not to stand in the queue. I am not depositing my share. The industrialists talk of recession. If there was recession, how could you justify it? Bulk of it has come from the private sector. If there is a huge stock-piling with high rate of interest of 18 to 19 per cent, the private monopolists, the private capital are going to have the stock-piling. And this is the position of the Communists, rather the leftists.' I am happy to know it.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Even, despite the Bombay textile strike, there is a huge stockpiling of cloth.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not ready to accept their position because they are saying as the FICCI is saying, industrialists are saying that there is recession, liberalise credit.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Don't use this cover. Already in the alloy steel 50 per cent of the production has been cut down. There is a big accumulation of stocks of steel.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Please take your seat, I am not yielding. You have missed the point. I think there was lot of disturbance in your mind and I hope tomorrow you will correct it. because I don't expect that a leftist will come forward and say that there is credit squeeze and there is recession in the economy. This is the pressure that the industrialists are putting on us to libealise the credit. You cannot do it.

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: How can you safeguard the workers when the factories have been closed? I have raised it here. The factories have been closed. You don't feel the problems of the workers.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, Shri Bahuguna has taken a very strong exception to my decision of stopping the overdrafts

SHRI SAMAR MUKHERJEE: Seventeen jute mills are closed and another thirteen have been closed now.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Sir, I have taken the decision of stopping the overdrafts. When I took the decision of stopping the overdraft, before that the Prime Minister decided that all the outstanding overdrafts on 31st March, 1982,

Therefore, the responsibility for this Rs. 17.43 crores of rupees, we have taken ourselves. We have provided the States with a clean slate. And thereafter the decision has been taken that when you were starting with a clean slate, when ways and means position has been improved, and when we are increasing the central assistance also, and particularly the State of Mr. Mukherjee.... (*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: Not your State?

SHRI NARAYAN CHOUBEY : What is your State? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am yet to find out one single instance in which one year the Central assistance has been increased in respect of one State from Rs. 146 crores to Rs 290 crores. If you have any instance you show it to me. And why was it done? It was don mainly because, we wanted to protect the Plan size of the State. And the State Government indulged in all sorts of fiscal indiscipline. They did not give the correct figure. What do you expect from such an attitude? (*Interruptions*) When I said, "you give me the correct figure," they say they do not have the correct figure, and that my figure of Rs. 340 crores may be correct. When I say that I am going to convert that amount to medium term locan, then they turn round and say, 'may be a little more'. Therefore, that is the peculiar situation. (*Interruptions*) When I said, "you give me we shall have to take some sort of strong measures and that is the reason why, to accommodate their problem we have converted the outstanding overdrafts into medium term loans.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Instead of keeping things uncertain we accepted your figures.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am not making out this point. I feel that it is fully justified to give Central assistance to West Bengal. (*Interruptions*) There are certain other States. They wrote me a letter. It is not West Bengal. After geting my decision about overdraft, that Chief Minister wrote me another letter — it is not your State — saying "please cancel my earlier letter and confine to your figure"! It is not your State.

What I want to point out is that we are taking care of the problems of the Staets and after taking care of the problems of the States, if still there is no fiscal discipline, then I am afraid, fou cannot have discipline.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI NIREN GHOSH (Dum Dum): There is no financial discipline in the Centre.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: We are disciplining ourselves. I hope you will also discipline yourself. If we discipline ourselves, it will beneneficial to you and it will be beneficial to me.

Sir, the last point is inregard to the letter about which Shri Subrahmaniam Swamy and Shri Indrajit Gupta also mentioned and there is no need of taking the trouble of going through the letter. A number of hon. Members have raised it. I made a statement on the floor of the House. Therefore, what is written there is..(*Interruptions*) I said that we have to take into consideration the adjustment of medium term loans. And we are creating a situation in which we are in a position to pay back. We have not accepted any other conditionality. If you read the letter, obviously you will not read that part of the letter...

(*Interruptions*)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: We will read only what suits us.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I am sorry to remind you. (*Interruptions*) Let me have the privilege of reading what suits me also.

In paragraph 3 of my letter I say that with respect to the programme for 1982-83, the Government will adopt any appropriate measure consistent with the national policies accepted our Parliament. Therefore, if there be anything which is not approved by this House which is not acceptable to us, and does not fall in our line we will not adopt it. Where is the departure?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Would you come to the House before you agree on any new conditionality?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Every time we are making a statement. When are we not making a statement? The day we entered into the agreement, at the earliest opportunity we did it; we are coming and making a statement.

The second point is, what is the conditionality? What new condition we have accepted? What is the new condition we are accepting? Please point out that this is the new condition we have accepted. There is no new condition and there is no conditionality. The bare fact is that even if I give some money to Mr Indrajit Gupta, I will definitely like to ascertain whether Mr. Indrajit Gupta will be in a position to pay me back or he is going to pocket it. Therefore, this is the condition between a creditor and a debtor. If I find that I have to surrender my prestige, my national integrity and my economic sovereignty, I will not go for money.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Then why is the Sixth Five Year Plan not being discussed in the House?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: You can discuss it. I am sorry to tell Dr. Swamy that if he is interested in a discussion on Kuo Oil deal or what is happening in the States, who prevents him from discussing that? It is not correct to say that there is no scope for a discussion. At least in a few discussions I was present. We are discussing even the holiday controversy with the leaders of the opposition though it is a very insignificant matter.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Since we have embarked on a policy of liberalising imports which is admitted and not denied by you, I hope—without any corresponding access to the export markets of those developed countries, will this not lead to a bigger trade deficit instead of bringing that deficit down?

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: I have already replied to that point. I think, you have missed that. What are our efforts in the development strategy? Our development strategy is to sustain the growth at 5.2 per cent in real terms during the Plan period. One of our objectives is to make the public sector undertakings self-financed and self-reliant so that budgetary support is reduced, and to have 9 per cent growth in real terms so far as export sector is concerned. Even in this year 1981-82, the export growth was not of the order of 15 per cent, but it was in the neighbourhood of 13 per cent. Therefore, we are having a larger share in the developed countries also.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: But the unit value has been reduced.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Where are we liberalising imports? We are not liberalising in consumer goods. We are liberalising import to widen the production base for export and to widen the production base in critical areas where we are lacking whether in raw material or components or in technology. Therefore, it is not that we are going in for an all out liberalised policy as has been pointed out. (*Interruptions*) We had an apportunity of discussing in detail the import policy. If the hon. Members want we can have a discussion and then you will find that there is hardly any change. What did you understand when I said that a large number of items had been taken away

from OGL? That means to a certain extent we are having a restrictive policy; otherwise, it would have been under OGL. We do not want to import items in those areas. After all when you talk about the import policy, you should be accustomed with the phraseology of import policy.

About inflation, it is true that in the last week of July there had been an increase in the wholesale price index. But on 24 July, there was minus 2.2 per cent—a declining trend. When I have said that this is seasonal, it is precisely the fact that it varies during this period, What are the items where the prices have gone up? Prices have gone up in vegetable oils, fish eggs, gur, khandsari, sugar and vegetables. These are the seasonal items where seasonal fluctuation take place. It is nobody's case that we have been able to reach the stage of Zero rate of inflation. We have never said it. It was said neither by me nor by Mr. Venkataraman.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: During the elections you have said that it is zero.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: What we have said is that on a point to point basis, on 10th of April, the rate of inflation was zero. And in first week of May it was minus.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: In your letter to the IMF you have said that the rate of inflation is 8 per cent.

SHRI PRANAB MUKHERJEE: Taking the whole year into consideration, this year it is 1.2 per cent upto now. There may be some fluctuation.. (*Interruptions*) I do not think we are completely out of the wood. There is inflationary pressure in the system; but, at the same time, I can tell you that it is well under control.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI (Pollachi): Mr. Speaker I rise to oppose the No-Confidence Motion, tabled by the former Finance Minister and the former General Secretary of the Congress. As some of the previous speakers have said, this no-Confidence motion which has been brought against the Government on the last day of the session is an exercise in futility by the opposition parties. I am a member of the BAC and I know that you have allowed discussion on all important subjects. Now the members have been detained here for another three days because of this no-confidence motion.

A point which was highlighted during this session was the Bihar Press Bill. Almost all the opposition parties have raised that issue here, stating that it is a draconian Bill. I do endorse the views of the opposition parties in this matter. But I would like our friends to consider one aspect. When this Press Bill was introduced in the Bihar Assembly, the State Government published an advertisement in all the newspapers stating that they have framed this Bill on the pattern of the Tamil Nadu Bill. I would like Shri Samar Mukherjee to tell us whether it is not a fact that his party in the Tamil Nadu Assembly did not oppose this Bill, even though it is more draconian than the Bihar Bill, because even a head constable can arrest a reporter or editor without a warrant and keep him in jail for any number of days, as it is a non-bailable section. At the time of voting of this Bill in the State Assembly, the DMK walked out of the House. But the CPI and CPM did not join us. The Janata Party also did not support us. The BJP, on the contrary, supported the Bill.... (*Interruptions*) I know that the BJP is not there in the Assembly of Tamil Nadu and they cannot get elected to Assembly in Tamil Nadu. It supported the Bill from outside.

The opposition parties talked much about corruption. In our State the IRDP funds allocated by the Centre have been grabbed by the ruling party. That was not opposed or criticised by any opposition party in Tamil Nadu. Similarly, the grants allotted by the Centre for Food For Work Programme were diverted for other purposes. That was also not opposed by them.

Then, there was the shipping scandal. The Tamil Nadu Government wanted to buy three ships at the rate of more than Rs. 30 crores per ship from West Germany in the beginning. It came to nearly Rs. 100 crores. We intervened and represented the matter to the Centre, who stopped those purchases. Now the cost price per ship has come down to Rs. 20 crores or Rs. 60 crores for three ships. Thus, we were able to save foreign exchange to the tune of Rs.

[Shri C. T. Dhandapani]

40 crores. In fact, it could have gone down still further.

These are some of the things happening in Tamil Nadu, which have not been opposed by the political party at the State level. On the contrary they are supporting the local Government.

About the performance of this Government, I would like to say that the financial year 1979-80 was shared by two political parties, the Janata and the Lok Dal. Sir, I would like to say that the real income (aggregate) in 1979-80 was—5.0 per cent, whereas in 1980-81 it was 7 per cent. The real income (Perception) in 1979-80 was——6.8 per cent and in 1980-81 it was 5 per cent. Agricultural production in 1979-80 was—15.5 per cent and in 1980-81 it was 14.5 per cent. Industrial production in 1979-80 was—1.4 per cent and in 1980-81 it was 4.1 per cent. Like this, the figures go on. Besides, other international organisations have also commended the performance of this Government. In this connection, I would like to quote from the World Bank Report appeared in the *Economic Times* of today, the 16th August 1982 as follows:

> "China's growth record had been above average for a low-income country and India's recent increases in savings and its improved agricultural productivity should lead to continued increases in per capita income in the 1980s."

This is what was stated in the World Bank Report. I would like to further say that there is a news item from Moscow which appeared in todays *Times of India*, which I would like to quote as follows:

> "An official Soviet commentary hails India as a space power, a major agrarian and industrial nation which ranks among the top 10 countries of the world as regards a number of major economic indices.

The Indian Independence Day commentary by Tass recalls that at the time of its independence, India was an "agrarian and raw material appendix of the British empire" which plundered it to the last limit.

* * *

> "Even today the situation around and inside does not help India's peaceful social and economic development," the commentator notes."

What it has stated is, even today this is the situation. They have commended our efforts. It is further stated therein:

> "India was, however, sided by time-tested friends.."

AN HON. MEMBER: Is it an Independence Day message?

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI: It has been said by a Communist country. Another important thing they have stated here is whether our country is inviting foreign investment or whether we are encouraging monopolies or something like this. As far as India is concerned if I am correct, we have accepted the policy of mixed economy. Not only we, but any developing country should accept that. Then only they can produce more and feed their people. Even China, the most populous nation, has also revised its policy in recent times. Here I would like to quote from a news item captioned "Chinese Economist Wants Capitalist Methods Revival" as follows:

> "A radical revision of China's economic management system—including the revical of such long spurned capitalist methods and the restoration of trade agencies and exchanges—is advocated by a noted economist in an article in the "People's Daily" the official organ of the Chinese communist party.".

* * *

> "The article calls for allowing some competition though within the guidelines of planning " so as to do away with the bureaucratic nature of State-owned industry and commerce."

Further, it says:

> "In brief, revival of a number of capitalist trade practices is advocated to both facilitate capital turnover and give scope to the regulating functions of the market to benefit the development of the country's socialist economy."

So, for the development of socialist economy, outside investment is also unavoidable nowadays according to the Chinese economists. Therefore, just alleging the Government by saying that it is in the hands of the monopolists and others is nothing but politically motivated.

17 hours.

Another important thing which I would like to say is that this No Confidence Motion has been brought not against the Government but it has been brought against an individual—against the Prime Minister. Take for instance Antulay's affairs. We have heard many things about it. In the Antulay's affairs Maharashtra Government provided funds from its Budget Rs. 1 crore. The Prime Minister name was not there earlier. All the political parties sitting here represented in Maharashtra Assembly supported the formation of Trust. Soon after the Prime Minister's name was included, rightly or wrongly, knowingly or unknowingly then they started opposing the trust. In the beginning it was supported in the Assembly in which all the political parties are represented. (*Interruptions.*)

You say that your party is not there. It is not my fault. People have not elected you. It is not my fault.

Our friend Shri Unnikrishnan has raised Kuo oil matter. The matter came up saying that the file was missing in the Prime Minister's office, then only it was raised. It is a clear cut idea of some of the people—they always try to malign the Prime Minister and want to bring some kind of allegation against her.

Shri Bahuguna said about the Hindi issue. The department which takes hasty decisions is Akashwani so far as Tamil is concerned. It changed Tamil name Vanoli as Akshwani. When we referred the matter to the Prime Minister, immediately she ordered to maintain *status quo*. The people of Tamil Nadu are happy. I must appeal to the Prime Minister now again the same department is trying to injure the feelings of Tamil Nadu. Again some Hindi news are being introduced in T.V. programme and one hour play everyday and the regional languages are being pushed back. Hindi is being given some importance. One may say that it is being broadcast from INSAT. The entire North India knows Hindi. We talk about the national integration. Then why cannot we broadcast one of the languages from the South so that people in the North can also learn and understand the language of the South which has been accepted in our VIIIth Schedule? I would request the Government and the Madam to look into the matter personally.

Before I conclude, I would like to say about an important matter which even our former External Affairs Minister, Mr. Vajpayee, has not dealt with. This is about non-alignment in foreign affairs. I would like to say, we all read about the visits of the Prime Minister to U.S.A. I read a news items which has been written by one of the foreign correspondent. He said, "Mrs. Gandhi is the real leader of the non-aligned movement.".

India is the real country which leads the non-alignment movement, which I would like to quote:

> "Mrs. Gandhi as unquestioningly the most authenticate, the most powerful and the most respected voice of the Third World. India has once again established its position..."

It means, we lost sometime our position—during Janata regime that we have to accept.

> "India has once again established its position as being the conscience of the oppress of half of humanity."

> "On every occasion, the Prime Minister Mrs. Gandhi made it more than obvious, that although she was aiming at enlarging areas of agreement that was no question of making any fundamental changes in policies, concerning foreign relation or economic

[Shri C. T. Dhandapani]

set up in India which such firmness may not have yielded any dividend in the term of replenishment in American policies, it did help to underline the point that she had gone to America in search of Friends and not Masters."

These are the things which appeared in the Press.

Finally, I would like to talk on one point. They talk much about atrocities on Harijans and communal clashes. I would humbly ask, any one of the hon. leaders, sitting this side—anybody—can you stand up and say, I represent the weaker sections or I am protecting the interests of the weaker section? No. None-else.

SHRI RAM VILAS PASWAN (Hajipur): Including yourself.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why are you putting the words in his mouth? He will come.

SHRI C. T. DHANDAPANI: Mr. Paswan. you know me well. One leader is being identified as the communal leader. One leader is being indentified as the caste leader. One leader is being identified as the religious leader, because he has got access to the religious activities. They are not identified with any weaker section. But, whenever a Harijan is beaten or Harijan lady or sister is put into torture she thinks of whom? She thinks of only Mrs. Gandhi. There are occurrences, no doubt. Even in Tamil Nadu, there are occurrences. There are many occurrences because of the failure of the State Government. We represent to the Madam too many times, sit together and take up the matter. We know, one Gnana Sundari was killed. We personally represented the matter. She was gracious enough, she granted Rs. 5,000 to the mother of the deceased lady. Rs. 5,000 is not much. But you must understand her heart and sympathy towards Harijans and other weaker sections. sections.

Before I conclude, I would say this is the last-day exercise, futile exercise which I have already stated. It is nothing but a political vendetta and political frustration against this leadership. This is a vain attempt against a valiant leader. We have already stated on many occasions in Tamil Nadu. Even today, I say, she is the only leader. Mrs. Gandhi alone can give a democratic and stable Government. By saying this, I oppose this Motion.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members from the Ruling Party shall not take more than 10 minutes. This side also would take only 7 to 10 minutes.

Shri R. S. Sparrow.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW (Jullunder): Hon. Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, the subject today has been well debated. I will attempt to bring out only the main facts of the debate.

To start with, this particular No-confidence Motion, to my mind, holds no importance at all. It is impressively stated by some other speakers.

The point to see is that there has been no question, no problem, that was not discussed threadbare on the floor of this House during the last six weeks. One can recall that on certain important debating days, for instance, when the debate was held on the Mandal Commission's Report and also on the atrocities on Harijans and so on and so forth, none of the top galaxy leadership on the Opposition side was present. I very seldom see even the hon. Member, Shri Bahuguna, who has moved this particular motion today to take part in the debate on various types of subjects that have been gone through time and again. So, I cannot understand as to what basic significance this particular motion has and I fail to understand what is the real ground for this particular No-Confidence motion.

After all, it is easy to understand that a strong political party having a preponderate majority is seated here and to say or to suggest—Mr. Subramaniam Swamy did—that we should resign, one has to be a little rational. You say, we should resign. On what ground? Well, possibly, if you are angry and you bring in certain subjects to discuss to the discredit of the ruling party, all that you can expect is that perhaps under some circumstances re-polling may have to take place. I may tell you very clearly that this party is here positioned through the verdict of the people of this country and we are not going to run away in a huff on in confusion as it was done by the Janata Party after ½ years rule. There is no intention on our part to do so. We are going to stay right here and work out the complex problems of our country. The complex problems are there; certain aberrations are there. They are to be faced. Do you mean to say that like a coward, you put your tail down and run away? You should not expect from a Party of our statute to do that.

India, if I may reiterate for the information of my high-flown type Opposition members has done exceedingly well so far as our progress is concerned. India is the largest democracy with 700 million people to tend. India holds today the stature, actually and potentially amongst the first four powerful nations of the world. No one can deny this fact. You go and speak to anybody overseas, any intellectual, anybody who understands something about the potentialities and the factualities of any nation. India today stands among the first six nations where nuclear fusion, nuclear fission and other technological advancements are concerned. India's industrial production also now stands amongst the first seven countries in the world. That is where we stand today. There has been some discussion raised by the hon. Member Shri Charan Singh—he has gone away—about farming and farm products and so on and so forth. There were some members who said, we are not doing well in so far as food, etc. etc. is concerned. There was a time—he quoted an exemple 40 years earlier, during the days of Gandhiji and Shrimati Kasturba— when he said that the people were very poor. I want to refute that straightway. It is not the case. During the Janata Party's regime, I recall, because of maldistribution, because of being inert in their action, we lost so much of our food production. There is no doubt about it. 26 lakh tonnes of potatoes rotted down in the fields in Punjab, Haryana and Himachal Pradesh. Besides that, sugar cane was burnt in the peasants fields; in the village of Shri Charan Singhji also. Sugar set-back was so serious that it was very difficult to recoup from that shock. Not only that, wheat, paddy and other grain crops, they rotted, became blackened in godowns and silos for such a long time. There was no movement, no proper distribution and our economy was practically ruined at that time. And to recall just about the dishing out of the gold reserves of India, which you will agree, is the economic base of any country for give and take and for creating stability in economics, just thrown up to the four winds for a song. One feels very very sad about it, if I reiterate, about all these type of things, as to how it was all being worked out.

And you see, as I have previously told you, that we are on the way to progress in a very big way.

Some one touched on the subject of weaponry etc. India's armed forces are rated to be holding the best position at military training and worthiness. There can be no doubt on that account

All policies are set under the aegis of our Hon. Prime Minister and the Minister of Defence in a very balanced manner.

We are not going to rush around for anything whatsoever. We buy things which we want. Diversification of weaponry, according to the strategic concept, according

[Shri R. S. Sparrow]

to the technical concept, is being worked out methodically and with plans. I also want to reiterate that India's strategy, its culture, its civilisation, freshly displayed in their burnished lustre is now respected and revered the world over. These are all the things which are in a homagenous fashion, coming up to show as to where India stands. I say this because somebody was saying that we have done nothing in 35 years. Here is India, this type of power in South Asia, as also globally.

India's leadership equation has reached internationally today to an outstanding mark and there should be no doubt about it.

There is our Prime Minister sitting. Anywhere you go, everybody swears that here is one shining leader of the world. It may be Breznev or Thatcher or anybody-else. Compartatively, we fell very proud when we hear so much about this particular personality and about the way she is moving the country.

Not only that. India's high-level policies such as non-aligned, self-reliance, socialistic and humanitarian basis, are specifically admired by all people of the comity of world nations.

This is where India is standing and how India is moving.

May I say just one word, if you like, which some have already said as to what the Opposition did, which is now sitting here, many of the luminaries of the Opposition party having been in and shared the Janata rule. The performance of that Government has already been spoken about by many people.

The Opposition leaders have spoken so much about law and order. On that I have only one thing to remind you about. Law and order problems are there. This is a very large country and a complex type of country. In this country, there is always the law and order problem. But the worest of it was during Janata Party regime. It may be Pant Nagar or Agra or Aligarh or Aurrangabad or Amritsar, Kanpur, Belchi, Bihar atrocities and so on and so forth. There was no end to it and one would not wish to have that type of vision at all again. One further analysis I want to put before you.

Why are the Opposition rasing this no-confidence motion? I will answer the question in only one word: Frustration; in a very big way. Little factions and sub-factions they just do not belive in each other nor do they believe in any ideology. They are just fighting for themselves and somehow later getting hold of an old straw, they want to grab something on it and somethimes they fall on each other and say "Now let us do something with which we can show our existence." This is the sum total of really what the Opposition party working for. For what reason and why it is so done, is better understood by their own high command and their luminares.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You can complete.

SHRI R. S. SPARROW: I think you have given me very litte time.

As a free speaking citizen of India, I want to assure you about one thing. Whatever it may be, the inspiration filled caravan of our national progrees moving under the dynamic leadership of the hon. Prime Minister, Mrs. Indira Gandhi is not going to tarry. Such no-confidence motions or not, the forward march of our Party will be kept on with renewed vigour.

India's progressive course is set, and no force internal or external, will be able to deviate us from our dedicated, patriotic and progressive path whilst serving the motherland. That is our pledge and we are going to keep it up.

India will not stand any communal-led, parochial-led, class-led, fascist or totalitarian type of rule. Such notions, if any any-

where, will be strongly opposed and adequately dealt with. India will not allow Khalistan, Islamistan, Hindu Rashtriya or other such rule at the cost of Mother India's vivisection. This, we must remember. We are not going to allow it to happen India will remain a secular country that is wedded to an open democracy, as free as the wind. And this is one great example that is going to be there for the world to see - the finest and the largest democracy in the world, India, with all its potentialities about it. We will keep on working on such high democratic principle and traditions as were designed, nurtured set and implemented through the good hands of such high luminaries as Jawaharlal Nehru, Maulana Azad, Vallabhai Patel, Ambedkar and other great men of yore. And now under the dynamic leadership of our hon. Prime Minister, we will vigorously fulfil our set aim of achieving India's greatness in the present-day progressive age. This is a modern version of how we are going to go ahead.

Finally, I have a humble recommendation to make, to the Opposition Members. The humble recommendation is this: say what you may wish to say, but ultimately withdraw the motion with grace. That is all I want to say.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Unnikrishnan. Every hon. Member will take not more than ten minutes each. I do not differentiate between Mr. Unnikrishnan and somebody else. Every hon. Member will take not more than ten minutes each. Then I can give opportunity to all the Members who want to speak.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN (Badagara): Mr Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have listened with deep attention to many of the speeches that have come from the Treasury Benches; some lyrically extolling the achievements of the 'Golden Age' that has been ushered in since January, 1980, and some which sounded more like command perfomances. A refreshing change, however, for this debate is this. Though the Prime Minister is not here now, the leader of the House, she for a change was here to listen to most of the speeches. A question had been posed by my former leader, Shri Yashwantrao Chavan — who unfortunately is not here —he had posed the question and said that this is an exercise in frustration. Well, I still hold him in great respect. When on that fateful day in 1979 he moved a no confidence motion against the Janata Government headed by Morarji Bhai, he had referred to the call of the national duty. He said, 'I do not know what will be the fate of the motion, maybe it will be defeated.' I know and I can tell you that in the Party executive he and I had voted against bringing the no confidence motion but we were in a minority. So it was brought forward. But it was genuinely a call of national duty. I would have thought that he would have been gracious enough even if he had crossed the floor, to concede that there is still a sense of 'national duty' left for some of us sitting on this side.

The question is that 30 months ago when they came here, the Prime Minister, Shrimati Gandhi got a personal mandate more than a mandate for her party. She had then promised to restore the sense of direction and restore the loss of national purpose and said that the nation was debilitated and weakened and 'so we need a government that works' and she got the mandate for ushering in a government that works. I am sure Mr. Chavan Saheb would not disagree with me that in parliamentary democracy accountability is supreme and no confidence motions are basically parliamentary devices for testing this accountability. If that is so, it is time now that the Parliament of India, that is the Lok Sabha, takes an overview of what has happened to her promises and their fulfilment, the promise and performance of the last 30 months of the Congress (I) rule or misrule. That is why I feel that Chavan Saheb as well as my friend, Shri Vidyacharan Shukla completely missed the point about the purpose of the motion.

About Mr. Frank Anthony—he is not here—I do not want to say anything. He has been an apologist of power, whether it was British imperialism or all that followed and whenever anybody had power.

AN HON. MEMBER: And not for Janata.... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: There have been changes on many fronts—domestic and international. There have been changes in the security environment. A lot of problems this government or any government that would have been in power had to face. But the question is: how far they have fulfilled the promise? What is happening to that lost sense of purpose and direction, to the polity and to the economy? What is happening in the price front? How the economy is managed? These are the questions to be debated on an occasion like this. Also what is happening to the internal social cohesion and the larger purpose of national unity and also we will have to refer to that global phenomenon occasionally and how far new norms have been adopted to fight this global phenomenon and what is happening to our underlying assumptions of the Constitution and the institutional frame-work of the democracy. These are the questions which I would like to pose with your permission.

I am happy my friend, Mr. Vasant Sathe is here. These are questions which should normally agitate any one who wants to think aloud, any one who is sensitive and he is one of those on the other side who as we have found, has been thinking aloud! All that I will say is, may his tribe increase on the other side—Insha Allah! But there are others like Mr. Vithal Gadgil. He is not disturbed. He found the situation 'pulsating' and 'throbbing,' a 'dynamic' situation pulsating and throbbing with activity'! He is a very dear friend of mine. I do not want to cross swords with him But all that I can say is that it is very unfortunate that he should have chosen these epithets.

Now coming back, yesterday speaking from the ramparts of the Red Fort, the Prime Minister has called for a war on poverty and rightly so, when more than 350 million people or so are below the poverty line even after 35 years of independence it was right for the Prime Minister of this great nation to bestow some thought on it, at least, on an annual ritual like the Address from the ramparts of the Red Fort. The last round of the National Sample Survey revealed that percentagewise, and numberwise, there are more destitutes to-day in this country than at the time of Independence.

The Agricultural Labour Inquiry Committee says that during the last five years, the proportion of agricultural households has increased by 50 per cent. And, 350 million people do not have drinking water facilities to-day. It is a shameful thought. But, it is a thought to be remembered for summoning us to action. That is why the Director General of the World Health Organisation, Mr. Mehler, says that this is one of the most serious problems that India has to face. This is not what I have said. Sir, if these are the indicators of poverty landscape, on the other hand, the assets of the Tatas have reached, as somebody pointed out, an alltime high of Rs. 1,538 crores and Birlas Rs. 1,431 crores, not to speak of other monopoly houses and the new entrants to the big money scene. Mr. Venkataraman who is here, by one stroke of pen removed from the tax net—how many lakhs—20 lakhs or so of income-tax payers. So, where is the assault on poverty, reduction in disparities and concentration of economic power? The policy frame work continuously disfigures and dismantles the regulatory framework that was built up and it cannot be hidden.

What is the approach of this Government towards the industrial working classes? Not satisfied with the ESMA and the all-encampassing National Security Act, the new statutes are round the anvil to curb the basic trade union rights. They began with their approach revealed in the repeal of LIC Bill; then came repression in the Bangalore-based public undertakings strike which was supposed to be suppressed by sending the police to the homes of working class leaders. But, what has been happening in the last 7-month old strike in Bombay in the Textile Mill? That is also equally revealing. The hon. Labour Minister, while speaking the other day on July 9th, said that he would offer a magnificent sum of Rs. 30 per month as an ad hoc payment. This is about 4 per cent on an average of Rs. 715 paid to the lowest paid textile worker per

month. Not content with chat, the Registrar of Cooperative Societies of Maharashtra based in Poona sends this Circular. I quote:

"It has been brought to the notice of this office that certain urban cooperative banks have been thinking of granting loans to the textile mill workers on strike in Bombay. This is against the Government policy....Action of the banks sanctioning loans, to the mill hands on strike without permission will be viewed seriously and dealt with accordingly which may please be noted."

This is how the repression goes on. There is no money or success for the textile workers.

Sir while Sukur Narayan Bakhia gets another kind of treatment in Goa Jail, Galadharis get a royal welcome, this is how the textile labour at Bombay are being treated.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: I will conclude. Please listen. I do not want to go into details of many things. You should allow me to develop my arguments.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I have allowed it.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: A question has raised about land reforms. I would like to know the significant steps they have taken during the last 30 months? In their own Congress(I) ruled States how Bhajanlals and Jagannath Mishras and others have been implementing the land reforms. On the contrary when West Bengal Land Reforms Amending Bill came here it was lying here in the shelve of the North Block for 14 long months and then it was sent back That is your commitment to removal of poverty; you have been talking of commitment and Shri Chavanji also referred to that. What is the approach towards the working class, and landless and small farmers ? While on basic issues you have no perceptive solution, what is the administrative record on meeting the emergent situations like the drought? From May onwards, it was known through satellite devices and meteorological forecaste that we would face a drought but the redoubtable Minister of Agriculture still wants to place his bets on God. May I recall the drought of 1979? However, there is a difference between the 1979 drought and today's drought. In 1979, while we had a food reserve of 21 million tonnes foodgrains, in June 1982, our stocks were 15.4 million tonnes, and while the requirement of the public distribution system has gone up by at least two million tonnes.

Then, our foreign exchange reserves are on the sharp decline. While in June 1979, it was 5555 crores, in June 1982, it fell well below 2500 crores......(*Interruptions*). This is a result of lack of policies and a policy framework which is a total reversal from the path of self reliance. I would now conclude by only referring to my last point.

There has been an agreement on the supply of fuel to Tarapur, which I would not call a Reagan—Mrs. Gandhi's understanding, but it should be called Alexander-Barnes understanding! Mrs Gandhi while speaking in the House the other day, on 11th August, 1982, had said:

I quote:

"But the words of the Threaty are not that the United States will supply, the words are that they will make arrangements to supply." That is what she said.

But I would invite the attention of the House to clause II-A of the 1963 Agreement which says:

"During the period of this Agreement, the United States Commission will sell to the Government of India and the Government of India will purchase from the United States Commission, as needed...."

Now, I am one of those who pay maximum amount of respect to the Prime Minister, particularly her contributions to

[Shri K. P. Unnikrishnan]

the conception of self-reliance and scientific temper that she had tried once to intoduce in this country. But the central thrust of our nuclear strategy whether it was our approach to discriminatory non-prolifieration treaty or peaceful nuclear explosion or attitude to safeguards, have been advancement of the cause of nuclear self-reliance which has been undermined by the Alexander-Barnes Agreement.

The Prime Minister has referred to our breakthrough on MOX route and claimed that gains of the research are never wasted. In an academic sense, this may be true, but could she tell us which other reactor in India can use the MOX route on which we have spent over Rs. 40 crores? The world knows that Tarapur alone uses low enriched uranium (LEU). If that is so, what was it exactly that she meant when she said that the fruits of MOX route research would not be wasted. Again this could have been done in 1981 as well, when Malone was here. You are allowing the USA to go scot-free.

The United States, as the non-supplier, is not only guilty of violating an International Agreement of 1963, and International Law, a treaty as defined in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969. Article 27 clearly says that a party may not invoke the provisions of its Internal Law as justification for its failure to perform the Treaty....

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude now. Your party has been allotted five minutes; you have already taken 17 minutes.

SHRI K. P. UNNIKRISHNAN: Instead of hauling them up for a material breach of the bilateral treaty, she has gone and compromised our position, that is my charge.

Sir, I don't want to take much of your time except to say that this is the result of the Government's total retreat and abdication of the earlier position of self-reliance path and that I commend the No-confidence Motion moved by Shri Bahuguna.

THE MINISTER OF DEFENCE AND HOME AFFAIRS: (SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have very little to say because they have made very few points against the Home Ministry. Therefore, I will not take much of the time. Only to start with I would like to remind my Hon. friend, Shri Unnikrishnan that he commended the no-confidence motion moved by Y. B. Chavan, and it brought down the Government.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: It was only because of defections.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: What ever it is, it brought down the Government.

Sir, several speakers have referred to the following points;

(i) atrocities against the minorities; (ii) The north-eastern situation; (iii) the atrocities against the women; (iv) the Press Bill; and (v) Punjab situation. These are the five points that have been raised.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: What about the Arab money for Meenakshipuram ?

SHRI. R. VENKATARAMAN: It has nothing to do with here. What Subramaniam Swamy mentions, I always ignore.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Because they are not very much relevant. Isn't it?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: So far as the atrocities against the minorities are concerned, this was debated at great length on 29th July. Actually you may remember. Sir, I told the House that I will sit as long as the Hon. Members want and I will answer the debate. The debate went on till 9 O'Clock in the night and none of the leaders who are participating in the no-confidence motion. showed their faces there. Certainly, Sir, if they felt that it is a matter of great importance, then they should have come

and participated in it and given their valuable suggestions, which I have always been ready to consider. But unfortunately, nobody turned up and the final attendance at the time when we closed the debate was somewhere in the single digit.

I did give the figures with regard to the situation and I specifically mentioned that the Government are not complacent about the situation relating to the minorities. We are really unhappy that in several parts of the country the atrocities against minorities are being committed. And this is a social evil which must be tackled by a co-operation of all sections of society.

Here, Sir, as I pointed out at that time the main reason for this kind of atrocities it is not so much a class conflict or a caste conflict, as it is an economic conflict. For instance, when a Harijan wants a minimum wage, the other caste law owner begins to take action against him. Then it becomes a conflict between the castes. When ever a share-cropper, a tenant wants his rights and he asserts that, then it becomes a conflict between the landlord and the tenant and then it assumes again the conflict of a communal clash, though, in fact it is an economic dispute. Likewise whenever the land, which is rendered surplus in certain areas are given by the Government to the Harijans and to the weaker sections, it is resented by the other classes and then certain clashes take place. Therefore, to give it a colour that it is all the time a communal clash and that it is due to communal atrocities that these things occur, is not a correct appreciation of the situation. Therefore, I poined out at that time that the Government will endeavour their best to see that the legitimate rights of the weaker sections are protected; that we will see that orders are issued to the State Government to see that they protect the legitimate rights, the legal rights, the minimum wages, etc., so that we are able to give protection to the weaker sections and thereby bring about a kind of better relationship and prevent the recrudescence of these things.

I do not give more details about this since as I have stated the policy of the Government in this matter is that, there is no point in saying it was five persons more in the previous year, or one person less in the next year, and that is not the real way we have to deal with this subject. I have already mentioned in what way one could do this.

The next point which has been mentioned is the matter relating to the North-Eastern region. Shri Bahuguna said that the North-Eastern region is in flames. I would like to remind him that the North-Eastern region is not in flames and that the flame has been now brought under control. Actually, the last bandh—the Janata bandh — which they called on the 15th of August has been only a token one. There has been very little participation in it. The announcement by the Government that we will have a round of talks on the 25th of August has had a very salutary effect and we are looking forward to a dialogue with the Government, the Opposition Parties and the parties concerned in Assam. Therefore, I should say that the situation in Assam is now tending towards a smooth settlement and it would be wrong to say that it is in flames.

If you take Mizoram—a definite policy statement that we will have nothing to do any more with Laldenga, that we are going to strengthen the popular Government there has been made—we are giving every support to the Government to suppress those illegal and unlawful activities and it has brought about such a change in the climate that for the last one month there has not been even one incident.

If you take the case of Manipur, again, we are increasing the CRP presence. Mani pur has been the scene of a number of outbursts, particularly hon. Members will remember a very sad incident where about 19 soldiers were ambushed by a group of insurgents. Since then we have strengthened the CRP and the BSF and we are trying to comb the area and remove any possible underground activity in that area. I am glad to say that since then there has not been any major incident

[Shri R. Venkataraman]

Then I will come to the next question relating to the dowry deaths and actocities which have been mentioned. This again was discussed at great length on the 15th of July when again I would like to mention that in spite of the long discussion very few, people — leaders of opposition Parties — participated, thereby making it almost an exercise in futility because I expected in these discussions the leaders of Parties will be able to make some constructive suggestions. Instead of merely going on saying that an incident has occurred in some place, and that in another place abduction occurred, and in yet another place repeating it, that a sparrow took-away another grain, and so on, it is much better that we sit together in Parliament and say what are the steps that should be taken to check this kind of things — well unfortunately they did not think it worthwhile perhaps, or necessary perhaps to make any such suggestions. And, therefore, to make a great issue now and to say that this Government has lost the confidence of this House for not having tackled this problem is to say the least.

(*Interruptions*)

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Hypocrisy.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I do not want to use such strong language.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: Ridiculous!

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: I say it is untenable.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Venkataraman, ignore him as usual.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: He tries to put words in my mouth which I will never use. I have been trained in another school where the vocabulary learnt is different from what he has learnt.

The next point relates to the Bihar Press Bill. On that we have had a long discussion. And I have explained to the House that we had not received at that time the Bill for consideration. We have now received that Bill from the Bihar Government.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: What is there to consider?

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: You should know as a lawyer as to what is there to consider. Under the Constitution if any provision of the State legislation is contrary to a provision of the Central legislation, the State legislation will not have effect unless it is assented to by the President. In the Bihar Press Bill there are certain provisions in the Criminal Procedure Code which are contrary to the Criminal Procedure Code as accepted by the Centre. Unless the Central Government assents to the Bihar Government Bill in respect to these amendments to the Criminal Procedure Code, the Bihar provision will not have any effect of overriding the Criminal Procedure Code. Here the Government will have to exercise its judgment in making its recommendation. So far as the other aspect is concerned, viz. amendment to the Indian Penal Code, I have already pointed out that the Government of India had given assent to the Tamil Nadu Bill, Orissa Bill. I have also pointed out Mr. Bahuguna was then a Member of that Government that their Government had brought forward a Bill before the Rajya Sabha and then got it passed in the Rajya Sabha, containing an amendment to Sections 282 and 282A almost identical to the Bihar Bill. So, it does not lie in your mouth to say that I am doing a great injustice. The Lok Sabha was dissolved and that is why it was not taken up in Lok Sabha. So, any amount of explanation by you cannot wipe out the fact that you were a party to the amendment of Section 292 and 292A, which you put forth and got passed in he Rajya Sabha. Therefore, the charge that we are doing something wrong is utterly baseless. It is a thing which any Government, which is in power, feels that it has got to regulate it whenever it is abused. If you say that the power to regulate does not exist with the Government, then you must question the very section and the very article of the Constituion. Why is it that it has been provided in Article 19(2) that reasonable restrictions can be placed?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Has the Central Government considered the neces-

sity of the Bihar Government bringing forward this Bill? Mr. Sathe has said that they have had no time to examine it.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: The Bill has been received by the Government of India yesterday or today and the Government of India will have to exercise its judicious judgment on the propriety, validity, necessity, etc. Nobody can say how I should exercise or the Government of India should exercise it. It is for the Government to consider this. We will exercise it in the manner in which we find advisable to do it. So, no question arises of the Government of India having done anything for which you can bring a no confidence motion against it. You could have moved a Vote of No-Confidence against the Bihar Government, if you thought it fit, but you could never have moved a Vote of No-Confidence against this Government on this basis, because we have not done anything; it has just come to us.. .(*Interruptions*). You said "you". Whom did you mean by "you"?

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTI: You represent the Government of India and you have supported the Bihar Bill. Today also you have supported it.

SHRI R. VENKATARAMAN: It is totally wrong. You are making an irresponsible statement. Therefore, I say that this No-Confidence Motion has no basis whatsoever, because occasion has been provided to discuss every one of the points raised here. This is just by way of letting out of steam, and they have let it off.

MR DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Shri Chitta Basu. If he takes more than ten minutes, I will call the next speaker. The Prime Minister will be called at 7 p.m.

SHRI CHITTA BASU (Barasat): Sir, I rise to support the motion moved by Shri H. N. Bahuguna. I support the motion, not because of a narrow partisan or short-sighted stance, or opposition for opposition's sake, but from a fundamental position of opposition to the policy stance pursued by the Government of India, particularly during these 31 months. It is a question of policy stance and fundamentally we differ from the policy which the Government of India pursued for the last 31 months. We are opposed to it. Therefore, as a call to the nation, we have sponsored this motion. This has to be made clear.

As you have made clear to me, I am also conscious of the limitation of time. So, I will be precise and to the point. The Government have failed to eradicate corruption; not only have they failed to eradicate it, they have institutionalised corruption by the plea that it is a global phenomenon. The Government have adopted an anti-working class attitude and mounted an attack on the rights, liberaties and the fundamental right to strike of the working class. The Government have also failed to curb the communal forces, the divisive forces, the forces of parochialism, which ultimately pose the greatest possible danger to the unity and integrity of the country. The Government have also failed to meet the offensive unleashed by these forces, who want to denigrate the prestige and position and the social responsibility of the harijans, the down-trodden and weaker sections of the community. The Government have also failed to protect the freedom of the press. Just now Shri Venkataraman was saying that they have got nothing to do with it, it is the Government of Bihar which has brought this legislation. But it is the duty and responsibility of the Government of India to protect the freedom of the press. They have failed to discharge this function in their capacity as the Government of India. Not only that, they have acquiesced in the decision taken by the Bihar Government. This is eloquently clear that they have failed to preserve the freedom of the press.

18 hrs.

I do not also want to present a bigger list of failures of the Government. The Government have also failed to ensure the remunerative prices for the agricultural producers in the country. The Government have also failed to ensure fair wages for the agricultural labour of our country. There can be a long list like this regard-

[Shri Chitta Basu]

ing the failures of the Government. Therefore, the objective is not to malign the Government or to denigrate a particular personality, but the attempt or the efforts is to highlight these problems and caution the Government that unless they correct their position unless they remove the distortions in the economic policies that they are pursuing, it is the country and the countrymen alone who will take their own decision about you. When I say this, say that people of our country have already expressed their disapproval about the policies that you have pursued during these 31 months. The people got the earliest opportunity of giving their verdict. Here, I mention the election results of May, 19. If you look at one figure, you will agree that the people during the May 19 elections have given the verdict of disapproval of your policies.

Sir, the Congress(I) won only 135 out of 441 Assembly seats contested by the Congress(I) in four States. In all, the Congress(I) contested in 441 Assembly constituencies and they have won only in 135 constituencies. What does it indicate? (*Interruptions*). Is it not clear? Does it now show that the majority of these four States have gone against them and have expressed their verdict of disapproval of the policies that they have followed.

There were 7 Lok Sabha bye-elections and what is the result? The result is that you have won only in three and lost in four. I have other figures to show that the people have already given their verdict, the verdict of disapprovtl of the policies pursued by you.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Mr. Chitta Basu, the total number of M.L.As. in India are 648, according to you?

SHRI CHITTA BASU: There was a mini general election. Sir, they got a mandate in 1980. They are proud about it and they feel that because of the mandate they can impose certain policies which are anti-people, anti-working class and which tentamount to surrender and self all out of the economic goals, sovereignty and independence. (*Interruptions*.) They claim it. But when I say this, you will also agree that by another verdict, the people have reversed their mandate. This is one of the charges from this side that the mandate of which you are proud has been reversed by the people because of the election results of May 19. You contested 441 Assembly seats, but you won only 135. You contested in seven Lok Sabha bye-elections, you lost four and won only three. (*Interruptions*). You lost four and won three seats. (*Interruptions*). In West Bengal too, your Party suffered the most ignominous defeat, although you have combined all the communal forces and reactionary forces under your umbralla. Therefore, it is with the help of reactionary forces you combined all the casteist and communal forces even in Kerala. And what is the difference? You have won only by one per cent margin, if I am correct, and that too when you combined under your umbrella all the communal forces, all the casteist forces and all the reactionary forces, And you won only by a margin of 99 per cent. Therefore, it is quite clear.

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Please conclude in two or three minutes.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: You should also take into account the time that you have taken.

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: That is why I am giving you two to three minutes now.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: Thank you.

It is clear that the ruling party is getting alienated from the masses. There has been erosion of support. There is winding of charisma of the Prime Minister. There is no doubt about it. The more you get alienated from the people. the more of your charisma is being eroded, the more draconian you become, the more authoritarian you become. ESMA, MISA and other hostile laws speak volumes of it. We have got great doubts and apprehensions that eclipse of parliamentary democracy is imminent under you. The Prime Ministerial candidate in Rashtrapati Bhavan, the partisan and unilateral appointment of the Election Commissioner, an attempt to pack the Supreme Court and Judiciary with so

called committed judges, the eclipse of particular democracy becomes imminent. The Prime Minister is on record to say that she has got nothing to debate whether there is necessity of switching over to presidential form of Government. She did not denounce the idea. She said, "What is wrong with it?" She did not denounce even the concept of Presidential system. She said, "It is also a democratic system." Therefore, with all this it cannot but raise doubts, apprehensions on this side that you are working in the way of acqiescing parliamentary democracy.

You have also taken certain position on economic fronts which tentamounts to surrender, capitulation and sell-out of India's national interests.

The last point is regarding the so-called Tarapur agreement. I would only like to remind the Prime Minister that External Affairs Minister is on record to say in this House:

> "What remained to be done to the Indo- U.S. Agreement was to arrange a decent burial"

This is what he said. What he says now, it is not even dead, it is to be resurrected. Therefore . . . . . .

MR. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Therefore, you have to conclude.

SHRI CHITTA BASU: This compromise, it is nothing but a climb-down of India's position regarding Tarapur. This is nothing short of a compromise and this compromise no self-respecting nation can accept. Therefore, on this policy issue which you could not give me time to explain but broadly I have mentioned, it is on these policy stands we oppose the Government. Therefore, I would urge upon the Government through you either to change the practice of distortions, change the direction which is disasterous, or the people will give their verdict. Of course, we cannot dislodge you from the power.

श्री चन्द्रशेखर सिंह (बसका) : उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, विवाद के कुछ प्रमुख मुद्दों पर अपने विचार व्यक्त करने के पहले मैं यह आवश्यक समजता हूं कि बिहार प्रेस बिल के सम्बन्ध में दो शब्द निवेदन करूं ।

यह अफसोस की बात है कि अनावश्यक विवाद इसके सम्बन्ध में बड़े जोरों से हम लोगों के बीच खड़ा हो चुका है और जो विवाद चल रहा है उसमें तर्क की गुंजाइश कम है, उत्तेजनाएं अधिक हैं । मेरे सामने तमिलनाडु, उड़ीसा के कानून मौजूद हैं । बिहार के बिल के जो प्रावधान हैं वे हूबहू तमिलनाडु और उड़ीसा के कानून से एकरूपता रखते हैं और कोई ऐसी नई बात नहीं है जो बिहार के कानून में जोड़ी गई हो । फिर भी हमारे विरोधी दल के माननीय सदस्यों ने और प्रेस के लोगों ने तमिलनाडु और उड़ीसा के कानून के बारे में कोई चर्चा उस समय उठाने की कोशिश नहीं की। आज हमारे विरोधी दल के सदस्य कहते हैं कि ड्रेकोनियन मेजर है, उनको अपने बगल में बैठे श्री बीजू पटनायक जी से पूछना चाहिए कि उनके शासन काल में इस तरह का कानून बनाने का क्या औचित्य था । वे उड़ीसा में इस तरह का कानून बनाने के लिए क्यों बाध्य हुए ?

अभी गृह मंत्री जी ने स्पष्ट किया है कि इसमें कोई वैधानिक कठिनाई नहीं है और ये तमाम लोग आज महसूस करते हैं कि येलो जरनलिज्म को रोकने के लिए और जिस पत्रकारिता का उद्देश्य मात्र चरित्र हनन है, उन प्रवृत्तियों को रोकने के लिए कुछ करना आवश्यक था । लेकिन फिर भी मैं आपसे निवेदन करना चाहूंगा कि हम कांग्रेस पार्टी के सदस्यगण प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता में पूर्ण विश्वास रखते हैं और प्रधान मंत्री जी ने भी अनेक मौकों पर साफ कहा है कि हम प्रेस पर

[श्री चन्द्रशेखर सिंह]

कोई पाबन्दी नहीं लगाना चाहते हैं, क्योंकि हम उनके विचारों के नजदीक आना चाहते हैं, जानकारी प्राप्त करना चाहते हैं। प्रेस को खुद आज यह विचार करना है कि आज की पृष्ठभूमि में वे क्या भूमिका अदा कर रहे हैं और वे अपनी जिम्मेदारी कहां तक पूरी कर पाए हैं। लेकिन इस मौके पर मैं यह भी दोहराना आवश्यक नहीं समझता हूं, जैसा कि गृह मंत्री जी ने अभी कहा है कि इस प्रकार का कानून जनता पार्टी की सरकार ने अपने समय में राज्य सभा में पारित किया और लोक सभा में इसलिए नहीं पारित हो सका, क्योंकि लोक सभा विघटित हो गई थी और यह कानून नहीं बन सका, लेकिन इसका अफसोस हमारे डा० स्वामी को हो सकता है कि यह कानून उन्होंने नहीं बनाया। हम तो प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता में विश्वास रखते हैं और इस सदन के माध्यम से प्रेस के बन्धुओं से निवेदन करना चाहते हैं कि इस बिल के सम्बन्ध में ऐसे अवसर पर वे आन्दोलन करने का विचार छोड़ दें और अपनी बात सरकार के समक्ष रखें और हमें पूरा विश्वास है कि भारत सरकार उत्तेजना रहित हो कर सभी मुद्दों पर विचार करेगी और जो उचित निर्णय इस सम्बन्ध में करना होगा प्रेस की स्वतंत्रता कायम रखने के लिए और येलो जरनलिजम को रोकने के लिए, दोनों मुद्दों पर सन्तुलित निर्णय केन्द्र सरकार लेगी। आज जो वातावरण विरोधी दल के सदस्य बनाना चाहते हैं, वह वातावरण इस विषय पर संतुलित विचार करने के लिए बाधक है। यह बात हमें सोचनी चाहिए और प्रेस के बन्धुओं को भी सोचनी चाहिए।

उपाध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं एक विषय पर और एक मिनट के लिए चर्चा करना चाहूंगा। वाजपेयी जी ने बड़े आवेश में मुंगेर की घटना का जिक्र किया। मैं वहां दो बार जा चुका हूं। और मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि मुंगेर में जो घटना हुई उससे वहां के मुसलमानों का केवल इतना ही कहना है कि उन्हें कोई एतराज नहीं है। वहां के मुसलमानों ने, मुंगेर के, जमालपुर के अल्पसख्यकों ने साफ शब्दों ने कहा है कि शासन ने जो कार्रवाई की, घटनाओं को रोकने के लिए जो प्रभावकारी कदम उठाया, उससे उनके मन में पूर्ण सन्तोष है और इसकी वे प्रशंसा करते हैं। इसके लिए वहां के लोक शासन की खुले आम प्रशंसा कर रहे हैं। मैं वाजपेयी से कहना चाहूंगा कि और मुद्दों पर आपको बोलने की इजाजत जरूर है और इस पर भी इजाजत है लेकिन जहां तक साम्प्रदायिक मुद्दों का सम्बन्ध है कम से कम आपको कांग्रेसजनों को सबक सिखाने और सीख देने का हक नहीं है और इसकी चेष्टा आप न करें। कांग्रेस के लोगों ने साम्प्रदायिक एकता बनाए रखने के लिए कुर्बानियों की हैं और यह हमारी परम्परा रही है। आज हमारी तमाम कोशिश इसी बात पर केन्द्रित हैं कि किसी धर्म या जाति पर आधारित पार्टी की विषेले कांटें बोने न दें और इन विषैले कांटों को हिन्दुस्तान की राजनीति से हम अलग करने के लिए कटिबद्ध हैं। हमारे सारे प्रयास इसी दिशा की ओर संकेत करते हैं। इस वास्ते इस मुद्दे पर कम अज कम आप हम लोगों को क्षमा करने की कोशिश करें और कोई शिक्षा हम को देने का प्रयास न करें।

माननीय सदस्यों ने अनेक आर्थिक पहलुओं की भी चर्चा की है। वित्त मंत्री जी ने उसका विशद विश्लेषण किया है, व्याख्या की है। मैं उसको दोहराना नहीं चाहता हूं। आंकड़े देकर मैं आपका समय

नष्ट करना नहीं चाहता हूं । लेकिन यह सत्य है कि आज दुनिया के जो विकसित राष्ट्र हैं, उनके सामने बेकारी का तजुर्बा है, यह समस्या उनके सामने भी मुंह बाए खड़ी है, रिसेशन उनके सामने है, ग्रोथ रेट उनका माइनस होता चला जा रहा है । यू एस में भी पिछले वर्ष माइनस पांच परसेंट उनका नगेटिव ग्रोथ हुआ है इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन में । ऐसे समय में हिन्दुस्तान की सरकार दुनिया की उन चन्द सरकारों में है जिसने मुद्रा स्फीति पर, महंगाई पर काबू पाने में सफलता प्राप्त की है और साथ ही साथ हमारा विकास तेजी के साथ आगे बढ़ रहा है । इनफ्रा स्ट्रक्चर की आप चर्चा कर लें, एग्रिकल्चरल प्रोडक्शन की चर्चा कर लें, इंडस्ट्रियल प्रोडक्शन की चर्चा कर लें, इनवेंस्टमेंट क्लाइमेट की चर्चा कर लें, सेविंग्ज रेट की चर्चा कर लें, तमाम इसी बात को संकेत करते हैं, इस बात को बताते हैं कि हमारी आर्थिक व्यवस्था स्वस्थ है, सही दिशा की ओर हम आगे बढ़ रहे हैं और हमारी सरकार एक सही और बाजिव नीति का पालन कर रही है ।

कई माननीय सदस्यों ने प्रधान मंत्री की अमरीका यात्रा की चर्चा की है । वाजपेयी जी ने बड़े जोर से कहा कि उसकी उपलब्धि क्या हुई, हिन्दुस्तान को हासिल क्या हुआ ? मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि 1962 का वह दिन हम सभी लोगों को याद है जब चीनी आक्रमण के बाद हमारे देश में एक निराशा का वातावरण व्याप्त था और अमरीकी दूत हमारे दरवाजे पर दस्तक दे रहे थे और तब भी पंडित जवाहर लाल नेहरू ने कहा था कि ऐसे संकट के समय में भी जो सहायता हम दूसरे देशों से लेंगे, अपने देश की इज्जत और प्रतिष्ठा को कायम रखते हुए ही लेंगे, हम किसी के सामने हाथ फैलाने के लिए खड़े नहीं हैं । आज भी मैं निवेदन करना चाहता हूं कि हमारे सामने बड़ी विषम अन्तर्राष्ट्रीय समस्यायें हैं । इंडियन ओशन को आज एक न्यूक्लियर आर्मेडा की तरह खड़ा किया जा रहा है । बगल में पाकिस्तान में नए हथियार भेजे जा रहे हैं । तमाम समस्यायें और कठिनाइयां हमारे सामने हैं । लेकिन फिर भी प्रधान मंत्री जी ने वहां जाने से पहले ही घोषणा कर दी थी और उस पर वह कायम रहीं और शस्त्रास्त्रों के लिए हाथ नहीं फैलाया और यह स्पष्ट कर दिया कि भारत अपनी हिफाजत के लिए अपने पैरों पर खड़ा हो कर स्थिति का मुकाबला करने के लिए तैयार है, वह किसी दूसरे देश का आशीर्वाद या उसके बल से हमारे सामने जो स्थिति है उसका मुकाबला करना नहीं चाहता है । यह सबसे बड़ी खूबी की बात है । बहुत से लोगों ने उस समय कहा कि आज प्रधान मंत्री शायद रूस से एक दूरी खड़ा करने की कोशिश कर रही हैं । लेकिन प्रधान मंत्री ने चाहे लेबनान की समस्या हो, वैस्ट एशिया की समस्या हो, अफगानिस्तान का सवाल हो, पाकिस्तान का सवाल हो, इंडियन ओशन का सवाल हो तमाम विषयों पर वही शब्द उन्होंने वहां पर स्पष्ट कहे जो दिल्ली में और मास्को में भी एक एक शब्द का उच्चारण वह कर सकती थीं और इसलिये उन्होंने स्पष्ट कर दिया कि प्रधान मंत्री आज वहां गयी हैं केवल हथियार मांगने के लिये नहीं/हम तमाम मतभेदों के बाद भी उनके दोस्ती और सद्भावना बढ़ाना चाहते हैं । लेकिन साथ ही साथ दुनिया को आज जाहिर हो गया कि प्रधान मंत्री, श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी केवल हिन्दुस्तान की नेता नहीं हैं, सारे नान-एलाइन्ड वर्ल्ड की एकमात्र नेता हैं जिनकी आवाज में तमाम दुनिया की आधी आबादी की आवाज ध्वनित और गुंजित होती है ।

अन्तिम बात और कहना चाहता हूं । मैं बड़े गौर से सुन रहा था सी० पी० आई० और सी०पी०एम के सदस्यों के भाषण, और हमारे वित्त मंत्री जी ने ठीक कहा कि आज की विडम्बना यह है कि हमारे सी० पी० एम० के नेता एफ० आई० सी० सी० आई० की

[श्री चन्द्रशेखर सिंह]

भाषा में बोलते हैं, उनको भी आज इन्वेन्टरी जमा करने के लिये लिबरल क्रेडिट चाहिये और इसकी मांग यहां पर करते हैं । आज आप इस बात पर विचार करें सारी नीतियों का विश्लेषण करते हैं, प्रगतिशील अपने को बतलाते हैं लेकिन आप यह बतायें आज आप बी जे॰पी॰ और जनता पार्टी की संगत में, जो जातिवाद और साम्प्रदायिक तत्वों पर आधारित राजनीतिक दल हैं, उनकी संगत में सी पी॰ आई और सी पी एम हिन्दुस्तान में कौन सी राजनीति को जन्म देना चाह रहे हैं ? आप चारों तरफ घूम कर देखें वाजपेयी जी के आशीर्वाद से आप गरीबों का मसीहा ढूंढ़ने चले हैं । कौन सी शक्तियां, सूरतें आपकी बगल में हैं जो गरीबों का मसीहा बन सकती हैं ? याद रखें हिन्दुस्तान के इतिहास में प्रधान मंत्री की सबसे बड़ी देन यही रही है कि उन्होंने देश की राजनीति में देश के आम आदमी को केन्द्र-बिन्दु पर खड़ा कर दिया है और उसको इज्जत दी है, जो उसको पहले हासिल नहीं थी । इसलिये आज जो राजनीति आप खड़ा करना चाहते हैं याद रखें सी॰पी आई॰ और सी॰ पी एम॰ और खास तौर से सी॰पी॰आई॰ की विशेषता रही है कि हमेशा उनको आफ्टर थौट होता है । इमरजेंसी के जमाने में वह हमारे बड़े मददगार थे, लेकिन इमरजेंसी की समाप्ति के बाद उसके आलोचक बन गये । और आज फिर वह उस जगह पर खड़े हैं जहां 2, 3 सालों के बाद उनको अफसोस करना होगा और मंजूर करना होगा जो आज आप बी जे॰पी॰ के सहयोग से जिस राजनीति को वह खड़ा करना चाहते हैं वह गरीबों की पीठ में छुरा भोंकने की राजनीति है जिससे हिन्दुस्तान के गरीबों को सामाजिक न्याय नहीं मिल सकता है ।

माननीय चरण सिंह आंकड़े बहुत निकालते है और कभी कभी गलत आंकड़े भी निकालते है । मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि उन्होंने बतलाया कि 1971 में ऐग्रीकल्चर लेबर का परसेंटेज 17 परसेंट का 27 परसेंट हो गया । उनके आंकड़े बढ़ गये । लेकिन मैं बताना चाहता हूं इसलिये आंकड़े बढ़ गये क्योंकि 1971 की सेंस में ऐग्रीकल्चर लेबर की परिभाषा में परिवर्तन कर दिया गया और ऐग्रीकल्चर लेबर की परिभाषा में एक एकड़ से कम जमीन जोतने वाले लोगों को भी जोड़ा गया, समझा गया कि वह बेसिकली ऐग्रीकल्चर लेबर हैं इसलिये उनकी संख्या 17 से 27 परसेंट बढ़ गई । उसके सम्बन्ध में चव्हाण साहब ने स्पष्ट किया है आज न तो हम कबूल कर सकते हैं, न वहां पर बैठे हुए आधे से अधिक लोग आज चरण सिंह के दर्शन को कबूल कर सकते हैं, और हर आदमी को अपने दर्शन को चलाने का मौका मिल चुका है, और हिन्दुस्तान के आम लोग देख चुके हैं, समझ चुके हैं और विश्वास जता चुके हैं कि देश के गरीबों को सामाजिक इन्साफ अगर मिल सकता है तो कांग्रेस पार्टी और श्रीमती इन्दिरा गांधी के नेतृत्व में मिल सकता है, और कोई दूसरा विकल्प नहीं है ।

SHRI CHANDRAJIT YADAV (Azamgarh): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I am supporting this No-Confidence Motion knowing very well that, if this No-Confidence Motion is passed today, there is not a single political Party in the the Opposition or any viable alternative which can replace this Government. This is the tragedy of the political situation in India, and we must face this political reality today. But I am supporting this No-Confidence Motion because I think that this Government needs to be censured on certain major policies and programmes and issues.

It is a great tribute to the maturity of the Indian electorate that they have been changing the Governments peacefully through Parliamentary methods, and they have expressed their resentment and dissatisfaction whenever they were not satisfied with the policies and programmes pursued by a Government. It is not an ordinary thing that the present Prime Minister herself lost her Parliamentary seat in 1977. But the same people sent her back to power because the Janata Party which

came to power fell under its own misdeeds and misdoings.

A question was asked in this House as to whom the Congress Party represented, and Mr. V. C. Shukla, replying to it, has said that the Congress Party represents the majority of the Scheduled Castes and the Scheduled Tribes and the minorities. The point I want to make is this. The Congress Party which represents the poor people of the country, the present Government, has lost more than two and a half years without doing anything for those people. Today who are the biggest sufferers in our society? It is a matter of national shame that, even 35 years after independence, there are mass killings of Harijans, the communal riots are continuing in different parts of the country, and the majority of the people are still suffering because of social and economic disparities in the country. The Party which claims to represent these sections of the society has utterly failed to meet their urges and aspirations and also their necessities. This is my charge and therefore; I feel that this Government needs to be censured on this ground.

This Government has been saying that they are trying to bring a new socio-economic revolution in the country. A new 20-Point Programme has been launched. I have nothing to say about that; I am not going into the merits of the 20-Point Programme. I think, there are many good things in the 20-Point Programme. But the 20-Point Programme itself admits this. After 35 years, one of the Programmes is to eliminate bonded labour in the country. That means, even after 35 years of independence, we have bonded labour in this country.

Another programme in the 20-Point Programme is that we will provide drinking water to the people. Is it not a matter of shame that, even after 35 years of independence, we have not been able to make provision for the most important necessity for any citizen, that is, the drinking water? This is the situation.

Mr. Chavan has said that a no-confidence motion can be moved if the direction is wrong, and so long as the direction is right, there is no use moving a no-confidence motion. What I am saying is this. 35 years have passed since we got independence. Government must give a serious thought whether its policies and programmes are correct, whether they have gone in the right direction, whether they have the right priorities today. If every thing is honey and milk in this country, if the direction and the policies and programmes are right, then what is your answer to this, what is the reason why more than 30 to 40 crores of people in this country are living below the poverty line? What is your answer to this? Today India has the largest number of unemployed young men and women in the whole world. More than 2 crores of educated young men and women remain unemployed and without any hopes of employment in this country. Is there anything wrong or not? Social tensions are increasing in the country. All right, measures are being taken to increase the production. I agree. To increase the production you bring the National Security Act. To maintain the functioning of the services you bring the Essential Services Maintenance Act. Production is important. No doubt about it and everybody understands that. But where is the production going? Where is the prosperity going? India's national income is growing. All right. But is it not a fact that the per capita income in India is falling? If you see the rising prices, is there any answer? The purchasing power in this country is falling. Leave alone the poor people, leave alone the millions who are living below the poverty line, but even the middle class people in this country are suffering because the purchasing power is falling everyday in this country. I would like to ask what is the reason? Will the Prime Minister and her Government give a serious thought or not?

Production is growing. India is making certain major achievements in science and technology. Nobody is denying. As Indians we feel a sense of pride that among the developing countries India is one of the forefront countries which has made certain major achievements in the fields of science an technology. But, at the same time, when

[Shri Chandrajit Yadav]

India is the third poorest country from the bottom, it hurts everybody. I know that the Prime Minister must be aware of these facts and this is the time. If the Government is complacent, if the Government does not take care of certain things, social tensions will continue to grow in this country and our entire system will be in a great crisis.

Millions and millions of children in this country—90 million children become blind. They are suffering from lack of nutriton and therefore they become blind. For whom are you building the society of India? For our beautiful children. And 90 millions of them lack necessary nutrition and, therefore, they become blind or they are in the danger zone of becoming blind. Is it not a shame for us?

The Home Minister said, 'We are taking every measure to protect the minorities, to protect the Harijans and to protect the tribals.' I am not questioning your policy. I know that the Congress Party has a glorious tradition of believing in communal harmony. I know that the Congress Party has faith in secular ideology. But it hurts a person like me when I see that communal riots are not being stopped. I charge this Government and I would request them. If you are serious about increasing production, banning strikes, preventing the workers to go on strike and ask for their legitimate demands, you have brought these measures—why don't you bring this kind of measure? Will you bring a measure in this Parliament that those who conspire for communal riots and those who actively take part in communal riots will be subjected to capital punishment in this country because they are doing such a big crime? It is such a big crime.... (*Interruptions*) I am not with them. I have my own views. I know and I have nothing to do with the BJP and I am as much a critic, if not a less critic, as Madam Prime Minister, of the BJP's policies and ideologies. I would like to say that in spite of everything, communal riots are takng place in this country. Why does not the Government think on those lines? I will request you, if the Government is really sincere, I have yet to know and I have yet to see. In this country, when communal riots take place, hundreds of people are killed and if some of them are hanged, it will act as a deterrent, these are the people who conspire, these are the people who are indulging in communal riots and properties worth lakhs of rupees are burnt and innocent men, women and children are being killed and not a single person is punished for communal riot. It is a shame. Therefore, the Government should bring forward that kind of an amendment to the Act and take necessary action.

The last point is this. India to-day is facing this problem. If we do not take care of the growing socio-economic disparities in our country and take necessary steps within the foreseeable time to put an end to the growing socio-economic disparties, then, the millions of people will lose their hope and perhaps it may be the last chance. There should be no complacency on part of the leadership. The country has committed to the workers. If this is not attended to, there may be an anarchist situation. Our enemy will take note of what is happenng here and take advantage of it. So, this is a warning. Even after 2|1-2 years you have not been able to find a solution to this problem. Take for instance Assam. You have not been able to find a solution to the problem. Assam is still unrepresented. Therefore, I am saying that fissiparous tendencies, the communal forces are growing and they will take advantage of these things. I hope the Government will take certain effective measures to stop these. Otherwise the country's structure will be in jeopardy. With these words, I support this no-confidence motion.

THE MINISTER OF PETROLEUM, CHEMICALS AND FERTILISERS (SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER): Mr. Deputy-Speaker, Sir, I have a brief intervention to make. This intervention has been necessitated because the two hon. Members from West Bengal referred to the Kuo Oil deal pertaining to my Ministry. Particularly, the hon. Member from Basirhat asked a question about this particular company I would like to confine myself only to that. As a passing reference,

I will deal with one aspect which is rather disturbing, a point that has again come from the hon. Member from Basirhat. I have explained in the debate that took place in this House as to the conditions in which Kuo Oil deal was finalised. The argument that I had put forth with the statistics and reason was that with the prevailing conditions on the day the decision for the Kuo Oil deal taken was justified on the decision *per se*. I would not like to go into details. It has been gone into. Two hon. Members have only referred to two aspects to which I will come shortly. But, it is my duty, in a minute very briefly, to submit that the conditions prevailing at that time were deteriorating. Agitation in Assam had crippled our oil production. The oil market in early 1979 had been a seller's market. There was urgency on the part of the Government to import HSD. The previous Government, having regard to the difficulties, had already come to the conclusion that 1.43 million tonnes of HSD had to be imported and, immediately, after taking over and after having assessed the situation, it was felt absolutely necessary that we had to import immediately a further 1.45 million tonnes of HSD. So far as world market conditions were concerned, the prices of HSD dropped in January 1980 by 60 dollars per metric tonne, and stood at 299 dollars per metric tonne, f.o.b. Mediterranean on 1st February, 1980, and at the time of taking the decision, it had climbed up to 14 dollars per metric tonne. Saudi Arabia had announced a cut-back in the crude production. The prices of crude oil increased by 6 dollars per barrel in December, 1979, a further 2 dollar increase on 1st January 1980, and a still further increase of 4 dollars per barrel took place thereafter. The forecasts in January itself were that there was bound to be an increase in the price per barrel of crude oil. I had already quoted Platt's Oilgram and I would not like to go into this at this stage, but I would recall to the hon. Members the observations from one of the greatest authorities on oil, namely the Petroleum Economics Ltd. When they had said that the backward trend in the middle of February about the oil prices had come to a stop and the prices were only to be increased thereafter.

It is in this background that the Government had to go into the various facets of the matters. My hon. colleague had gone into the diverse questions. He had on the basis of the data come to the conclusion that the prices had hit the bottom and there was bound to be a price rise. In fact, I had suggested on that day also that even the official thinking was that it was the sellers' market. The two aspects that were proposed by my hon. Colleague were the long-term fixed price contract and also the performance guarantee. "These two were impossible" was the case of the officials; they themselves said that because it is a sellers' market, therefore, nobody would be in a position to come forward for the long term price contract, and if at all the tenders have to be invited at that stage, the official opinion itself was that the Parties would quote very high prices. It is precisely keeping that in view that my colleague thought that in the tenders that had already been offered with an escalation and de-escalation clauses, their base price should be treated to be the fixed price, and therefore, they should not be allowed to quote any further. That was the approach that was taken. And on the other question, when it was said that because it was a sellers' market and performance guarantee would not be forthcoming from the parties, my hon. colleague took a firm view that performance guarantee should be asked for. And then, I have already said, that the fall-out was that after this deal was entered into, we had to go in for 5.20 lakh metric tonnes of HSD in the open market, and I have already said that when this was purchased, we had to pay more price than what was contracted with Kuo Oil.

I would not like to go further into the various aspects of it. I have said that from the point of view of hindsight, it is possible for a particular person to come to the conclusion that there could be a case of national loss. I quoted para 93 of the COPU Report, and I would only recall to the House that COPU itself found fault with the Government of the day in 1979 in paying to Pertamina of Saudi Arabia... retrospectively an amount....

AN HON. MEMBER: It is of Indonesia.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I am saying that this is the Saudi Arabian company to whom the amounts were paid retrospectively as a result of which there was a loss of 15.8 million dollars. This is contained in paragraph 93 of the COPU report itself which says that it is rather strange that no legal opinion was taken, the empowered committee was by-passed, all the procedures were completely thrown overboard and a decision was taken to pay retrospectively an amount which has resulted in a clear loss of Rs. 15.8 million dollars.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have no answer.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Well, I would not go into these things as to what were the compulsions that forced the then Government to take this decision. Unless we go into these aspects, it is not possible for us to blame anybody. Therefore, what is relevant in deals of this nature, where there are long-term contracts, on the basis of the fixed prices, is that the prevailing circumstances on that day have to be reckoned. If there is a reasonable basis to come to a conclusion that the contract would be justified, then one cannot go into the question at a later stage by hind-sight on the basis of some perceptible approaches and come to notional conclusion and say that there was a loss. I would not now like to go into this aspect. I would like to straightway come to two aspects. which had been dealt with. One hon. Member, not with standing I had explained in detail about the file itself and I said that it was a genuine case, of misplacement, has been very unfair to observe....

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Loss of memory also.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Loss of memory of the Hon. Member.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: No, the Minister who sent it there.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Not the Minister I have already explained.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: Go ahead.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Sir, he made an observation with reference to the mysterious disappearance of the file and he said that the Prime Minister had been keeping silent on the issue. Sir, I have said and I will repeat that a mountain is maid of a mole in this affair. What could be the purpose? I have said earlier and let me repeat it for the advantage of some of the Members, who were absent on that day. If my explanation that this is a case of a genuine misplacement not to be accepted and it is sought to be said that it is a deliberate attempt to make the file scarce, then it could be only for two purposes. One is to make it scarce from the Auditors, who wanted to audit and secondly it was made scarce for the purposes of not showing it to the COPU itself. These were the only two grounds. Beyond that I am sure nobody even today can invent any ground, even if he wants to. Sir, I have already said that it was on the fifth of April that my Secretary informed the COPU that the file was available. I said it and I will repeat that either before fifth April or later, thereafter, at no point of time COPU ever called for the file.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR (Gorakhpur): Sir, it is a wrong statement. We called for it. I was a Member of it. We called for it.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: My hon. Member has unduly been in a hurry.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: Even verbatim records were manipulated.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I repeat that neither before 5th April, 1982 nor thereafter at any point of time COPU ever summoned this file at all.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: We had called for the File.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Will you please wait? (*Interruptions*) Will you listen to me? You can raise a privilege motion if I am telling anything wrong. I am repeating it and I am supported by...(*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: There is no mention in that.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: When I spoke in the other House—my statement made there may kindly be seen—Mr. Morarka has said, 'even though we have not summoned it at any point of time, it is your Secretary, who, on 24th March said that the file is not available and he sought time'. That is entirely a different story. I am quoting Mr. Morarka who has taken a very active part in this whole issue.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: We had asked for it simultaneously. (*Interruptions*)

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Mr. Professor,...(*Interruptions*) Sir, on the 7th of April,...(*Interruptions*) I would not like to...(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why can you not hear him?

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I would not like to repeat it, but I stand by my statement and if they want let them move a privilege motion against me, if they are so particular and so honest. I leave it there.

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: We are honest enough. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: If for everything anybody can interrupt, how can we conduct the House?

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Why can you not hear him? If there is anything wrong you can always take action. This is not the method. All are interrupting.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: For everything should you immediately react? It is not good. We cannot conduct any proceedings in an orderly manner if this is the position. You hear him. If you do not agree with him you can always take action. It is all right.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is prepared to face any number of privilege motions.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: On the 7th of April...(*Interruptions*)

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: For your information, there is no question of giving a new privilege motion. It is already pending. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You are entitled to give any number of privilege motion. Why can you not do it?

SHI P. SHIV SHANKER: On the 7th of April, 1982, the detailed aspects about COPU were put forth by my Secretary on the basis of the file. Therefore, the successor COPU if at all they are so particular, could have looked into the file and the file was available in April, 1982 itself. This is with reference to COPU.

So far as the Auditors are concerned, if at all it can be said, at worst it could be said against us that we have not made available the file at the time when they had asked for it. But, nonetheless, the file was available for their scrutiny. Therefore, the position I am trying to advance about this file, is, that of the two grounds on which it could have been said against us that we were deliberately trying to avoid it, both the grounds fall flat. That is the submission I am making. (*Interruptions*) The difficulty is that...(*interruptions*) The difficulty is that they are committed to be unconvinced. Therefore, I cannot convince them. One aspect which I must say is this: I may explain. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Hon. Members, you have raised many points and the Minister himself has come for-

[Mr. Deputy-Speaker]

ward to reply. You have not asked the Minister to reply. It is only for the Prime Minister to reply. But he has come forward to clarify. You do not allow it. I am very sorry. I am so sorry.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: I am very sorry.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: Any interruption, you do not record. Only his reply.

(*Interruptions*)*

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: I have said on the 22nd April, 1980...

(*Interruptions*)*

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: On 22 April, 1980 my predecessor marked the file to the Prime Minister because the Finance Minister was not available in the country at that time. Immediately when he came, my predecessor had a talk with him. He was advised that he should go for the long term contract based on the escalation, de-escalation clause. Therefore, my predecessors continued with that policy. They did not bother about the file. This is what I explained. These circumstances only prove that it was a genuine case of a mis-placement of the file.

My friend from Basirhat has asked about the paid-up capital of the Kuo Oil Company. In 1978-79 it was the IOC officers, who visited Singapore and other places for the purpose of short-listing the companies so that those companies alone be invited for the purpose of offering the tenders. In 1978-79 the IOC officers went and it was they who had come to the conclusion that that was a company worth being short-listed for the purpose of requesting them to offer their tenders. The Kuo Oil Company was short listed between 1978-79. Secondly, in this very case, my predecessor directed that they should give performance guarantee. They have given a performance guarantee of $ 5.3 million for the purposes of completing the contract. (*Interruptions*)

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: He is not yielding. Do not record whatever he says.

(*Interruptions*)*

MR. DEPUTY-SPEAKER: You need not take his permission to move a privilege motion.

SHRI P. SHIV SHANKER: Though the fact remains that I have not gone into the Article and Memorandum of Association of the Company for the purposes of ascertaining whether it has paid-up capital of $ 150, these two circumstances referred to suggest that it does not appear to be a Company with a paid-up capital of only $ 150 as is sought to be suggested by the other side.

One of the hon. Members from the other side was very unkind in saying—I am not going into the merits of the case itself—that the judges' conduct in the case appeared to be suspicious. The fact remains that if this expression were to come from any of our hon. Members, they would have raised a hue and cry. But none of them said a word about it. It is rather unfortunate. But I would like to say only one thing that I have known cases even in the Supreme Court when the judgments have been rendered more than a year and a year-and-a-half. Therefore, merely because a judgment has been rendered about a year or a year-and-a-half later, you cannot suspect the conduct of the judge. These people cry hoarse that the independence of the judiciary is threatened. But a very unfortunate expression has come from one of them. Without going into the merits of the case, I would like to go on record that this type of an expression deserves condemnation at all hands.

One last aspect I would like to deal with. A little controversy came up this morning

*Not recorded.

when Shri Vajpayeeji was speaking. I said and I reiterate that against Mrs. Gandhi warrant of arrest was issued. I stand by it.

19 hrs.

[MR. SPEAKER *in the Chair*]

श्री राम विलास पासवान : (हाजीपुर): अध्यक्ष जी, (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : यह क्या हो रहा है ? (व्यवधान)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष महोदय, अभी अविश्वास प्रस्ताव पर बहस चल रही है। और अभी इसमें जितने भी वक्ताओं ने भाग लिया, उनको देख कर मुझे आश्चर्य हुआ कि जिन-जिन को निकाला गया था, जिन-जिन को प्रधान मंत्री के द्वारा सेंक किया गया था वे ही अपने भाषण में ज्यादा लायल्टी की बात कर रहे थे, वे ही प्रधान मंत्री और उनकी सरकार की ज्यादा गुनगान कर रहे थे। (व्यवधान) अध्यक्ष जी, आप मुझे बोलने दीजिए।

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आर्डर आर्डर।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष जी, क्या इनको मालूम नहीं है कि इसके बाद इनकी नेता को भी बोलने का मौका मिलेगा ? क्या आप उन्हें इसी तरह बुलवाना चाहते हैं ? (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष जी, यह सदन जानता है कि कुछ दिन पहले चार राज्यों में चुनाव हुए थे। अगर आप हिन्दुस्तान का नक्शा देखें तो ये राज्य हिन्दुस्तान के पूर्व, पश्चिम, उत्तर और दक्षिण में हैं। जहां पूर्व में पश्चिम बंगाल है, वहां पश्चिम में हरियाणा हैं, जहां दक्षिण में केरल है, वहीं उत्तर में हिमांचल प्रदेश है। इन चारों जगहों पर आप चारों खाने चित्त हुए हैं।

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप ऐसा क्यों कर रहे हैं ?

श्री राम विलास पासवान : आप पश्चिम बंगाल में हारे, आप ने हरियाणा में, जिनको 6 साल के लिए निकाला था और बहुत गर्व के साथ निकाला था, उनके सामने नाक रगड़ कर, हाथ जोड़ कर, उनको आपको मंत्रिमंडल में लेना पड़ा और उस के आधार पर भजनलाल, भोजनलाल वहां मंत्रिमंडल बनाये। वहां 20–20 लाख रुपया दे कर के खरीद और बिक्री हुई फिर वे मंत्रिमंडल बनाये। (व्यवधान) आप लोग जो पुराने कांग्रेसी हैं, आपमें थोड़ी सी (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप उनको थोड़ा सा कह लेने दीजिए। क्या हो रहा है ? (व्यवधान)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष महोदय, थाड़ी–सी भी अगर इनमें हया और शर्म नाम की चीज रहती तो जिसको आपने 6 साल के लिए निकाला, उसको आप मंत्रिमंडल में शामिल नहीं करते। वहां पर 24 तारीख की डेट दी जाती है मंत्रिमंडल बनाने के लिए श्री देवी लाल को और 23 तारीख को चोर दरवाजे से गवर्नर साहब दूसरों को शपथ ग्रहण करवा देते हैं। . . .

THE MINISTER OF STATE IN THE MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS AND DEPARTMENT OF PARLIAMENTARY AFFAIRS (SHRI P. VENKATASUBBAIAH): Sir, on a point of order. Accusations cannot be made against a person who is not present in the House.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं यह कह रहा था कि यह नो कांफिडेंस मोशन सरकार में खुद उस दिन आ गया था जब कि यह पार्टी हिन्दुस्तान के चारों कोनों–पूर्व, पश्चिम, उत्तर, दक्षिण में जब चुनाव हुए थे तो चारों खाने चित्त हुई थी। आपकी सरकार केन्द्र में है। इसी लिए आप सब जगह पर अपनी सरकार बना सकते हैं।

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

लेकिन मैं आपको एक बात कहता हूं कि यह भविष्य के लिए आपको आभास है सत्ता में न आने का।

अभी हमारे साथी श्री वी० सी० शुक्ल जी और चन्द्र शेखर सिंह जी बोल रहे थे कि कांग्रेस आई पार्टी किस के लिए है, यह श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी की सरकार किस के लिए है। यह बोलते-बोलते उन्होंने जातिवाद की बात बोल दी। जातिवाद की बात आप नहीं बोल सकते हैं। जिसकी केबिनेट में एक ही जाति के पचास परसेंट लोग हों वह दूसरों को जातिवाद का सबक सिखाये। जिसके मंत्रिमंडल में 18 में से 9 एक ही जाति के लोग हो वह दूसरों को जातिवाद का सबक सिखाये। आप कहते हैं जातिवाद--कौन करता है "जातिवाद"? (व्यवधान)

मैं प्रधान मंत्री जी का बहुत आदर करता हूं, लेकिन मुझे एक बात याद आती है। एक बन्दर था, उसने एक सांप को पकड़ लिया और उसका मुंह तब तक रगड़ता रहा जब तक उसका जीभ लपलपाना बंद नहीं हो गया। तो प्रधान मंत्री के जो इतने लायल बन रहे हैं वे सब लोग इसी तरीके के लोग हैं--चाहे वी० सी० शुक्ला हों, चाहे चव्हाण हों या मगन भाई बरोट हों (व्यवधान)

वी०सी० शुक्ला ने कहा कि वोट--बैंक हरिजन और मुसलमान हैं, लेकिन जब से यह सरकार पावर में आई है तब से बिहार का परसबीघा, पितरा, गोवा, करसुआ, मधुबनी, वोध गया, जहांनाबाद जहां दो-दो बार घटना हुई यहां सब जगह देखिए क्या-क्या हुआ। जहांनाबाद के बारे में रामस्वरूप राम जो यहां पर बैठे हैं, उनसे पूछा जाए तो वे बतलाएंगे कि उस घटना में कांग्रेस-आई के एक मंत्री का हाथ है (व्यवधान) राम स्वरूप राम इज आन रेकार्ड।

अध्यक्ष जी, चाहे बिहार का मामला हो, चाहे उत्तर प्रदेश के कफाल्टा का मामला हो, चाहे देवली का मामला हो, चाहे साधूपुर का मामला हो, चाहे रामपुरा का मामला हो और चाहे मध्यप्रदेश के दुर्ग जिले का मामला हो, आप सब जगह देखेंगे।... (व्यवधान)

Mr. Speaker: Mr. Pande, will you keep silent please?

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैं तो तथ्य रख रहा हूं, कोई गलत बात तो कर नहीं रहा। ये सब घटनाएं एक कड़ी की कड़ी हैं और मैं तो यह कहना चाहता हूं कि अट्रासिटीज आन हरिजन एक नंबर सफदरजंग से शुरू होता है, जिसका उदाहरण मकवाना जी यहां बैठे हुए हैं, राजस्थान के मुख्यमंत्री श्री जगन्नाथ पहाड़िया हैं।

एक माननीय सदस्य : यह असत्य बात है।

श्री राम विलास पासवान : असत्य बात क्या है? करप्शन का केस चला अंतुले के ऊपर भ्रष्टाचार का केस चल रहा है बिहार के मुख्य मंत्री जगन्नाथ मिश्र के ऊपर, रिजर्वेशन के खिलाफ आंदोलन शुरू हुआ सोलंकी के ऊपर, हीराभाई परमार यहां बैठे हैं, हटाया गया हरिजन मुख्यमंत्री जगन्नाथ पहाड़िया को। (व्यवधान) यह किसको मालूम नहीं है।

अध्यक्ष जी, मैंने उस दिन भी कहा था कि हमारे देश में नेता की कमी नहीं है और न नीति की कमी है, लेकिन जब तक नीयत साफ नहीं होगी, तब तक देश का भला नहीं होगा और--आपकी नीयत साफ नहीं है। भले ही हिन्दुस्तान का हरिजन-आदिवासी, हिन्दुस्तान का मुसलमान आपको वोट देने का काम करता हो, लेकिन आपने उसके

साथ बफादारी नहीं की है, गद्दारी की है । सबेरे से शाम तक हरिजन की जय, मुसलमान की जय, आदिवासी की जय और रेडियो जब बन्द हो गया तो हरिजन का छय मुसलमान का छय आदिवासी का छय इस तरह से आप राज चलाना चाहते हैं ?

एक प्रश्न मैंने पार्लियामेंट में पूछा था ।

MR. SPEAKER: Mr Paswan, may I remind you that you have little time now? You must finish.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : आप इटरप्शंस रूकवा दीजिए तो मैं जल्दी ही खत्म कर दूंगा । मैंने पार्लियामेंट में साम्प्रदायिक दंगों के बारे में प्रश्न पूछा था जिस के जवाब में मुझे बताया गया कि जनवरी 1980 से जुलाई 1981 तक 449 जगहां पर कम्युनल रायटस हुए जिन में 523 जानें गईं और 4293 व्यक्ति घायल हुए । अप्रैल 1981 से मई 1982 तक 418 साम्प्रदायिक दंगे हुए और 228 जानें गईं और 3096 उन में घायल हुए । स्टेट वाइज चाहें तो वे फिगर्ज भी मैं आपको बता सकता हूं । इसी से आप सन्तुष्ट हैं, आपकी पार्टी सन्तुष्ट है कि हरिजनों का गला काटा जाए, मुसलमानों को रोज मारा जाता रहे, अल्प सख्यकों के ऊपर प्रहार होते रहें और आप खाली यहां शाउटिंग करने के लिए बैठे रहें तो मुझे कुछ नहीं कहना है । आपकी पार्टी की सरकार है । भले ही आप नौ-कान्फिडेंस के खिलाफ वोट दे दें लेकिन लगाम लगाने की जवाबदेही तो आपके ऊपर ही आती है । पालियामेंटरी डेमोक्रेसी क्या होती है, पार्टी का राज क्या होता है ? पार्टी चुन कर आती है, एम० एल० ए० और एम० पी० बन जाते हैं, वह अपना नेता चुनती है, कैबिनेट बनती है जिस की नेता प्रधान मंत्री होती हैं और प्रधान मंत्री जो चाहें होता है ।

एक प्रश्न मैंने किया था सीलिंग से जो सरपलस लैंड निकली है उसके बारे में । आप भूमि सुधारों की बहुत चर्चा करते हैं, लैंड रिफार्म्ज की बहुत चर्चा करते हैं । आज एम० पीज० और एम० एल० एज० का सुधार हो रहा है, भूमि का सुधार नहीं हो रहा है ।

Surplus nd declared under the revised ceiling laws ..	40,05,169
Surplus land taken over under the revised ceiling laws ..	26,09,656
Land distributed under the revised ceiling Act. ..	18,07,919

डिक्लेयर होती है चालीस लाख लेकिन डिस्ट्रीब्यूट होती है 18 लाख एकड़

No. of families benefited ..	13,54000
No. of Scheduled Castes ..	5,46,000
No. of Scheduled tribes beneficiaries ..	1,70,000

आप देख लें शेडयूल्ड कास्टस और ट्राइब्ज की हालत जिन के बारे में बड़ा हल्ला होता है ।

प्रधान मंत्री ने कल लाल किले से एक बहुत अच्छी बात कही और कहा कि पहले भारत को भीख मांगनी पड़ती थी लेकिन अब वह वक्त आ गया है जब हम स्वावलम्बी हो गए हैं । मेरा एक अनस्टार्ड क्वश्चन था नम्बर 4410 जो 19 मार्च 1982 को पूछा गया था और यह विदेशी कर्जे के बारे में था ।

[श्री राम विलास पासवान]

श्री प्रणव मुखर्जी साहब ने इसका यह जवाब दिया था :

The total balance of the repayable loan received by the Government of India from various countries, World Bank and other financial institutions as on 31st December, 1981 works out to Rs 14960 crores.

जो इनकी आर्थिक समीक्षा निकलती है या जो व्याख्यात्मक ज्ञापन होता है जो बजट के साथ दिया जाता है वह बताता है कि अंग्रेज जब यहां से गया था तब हमारे ऊपर कर्जा था 332 करोड़ लेकिन आज आजादी के 35 साल के बाद आपके माथे पर यह कर्जा हो गया है 14960 करोड़ । इसके अलावा आई एम एफ का लोन अलग है । फिर भी भारत की प्रधान मंत्री कहती हैं कि हम स्वावलम्बी हो गए हैं । किस गणित से किस हिसाब से वह कहती हैं यह मेरी समझ में नहीं आया है : यह जो जवाब है यह आपकी सरकार का दिया हुआ है, मेरा नहीं है ।

टाइम्ज आफ इंडिया जो 12 अगस्त का है इस में यह निकला है कि आपकी सरकार जब सत्ता में आई तो कहती थी कि मूल्य वृद्धि पर रोक लगाएंगे । मैंने उसी समय कहा था इसी पार्लियामेंट में कि जो लोग नारा लगाते थे कि 'जात पर न पात पर, इंदिरा जी की बात पर, मोहर मारो हाथ पर'—(व्यवधान) तो मैंने कहा था उसमें दो, चार लाइन और जोड़ दो, उसके बाद जोड़ लें "चीनी मिलें 7 पर, पैट्रोल मिले 8 पर, खाली कनस्टर मिले 8 पर, कुछ दिन के बाद मुर्दा जाएगा घाट पर" । यह हो रहा है । "टाइम्स आफ इंडिया" ने लिखा है टमाटर 10 रु० किलो, डबल रोटी 10-8-82 से 2 रु० 30 पैसे की जगह 2 रु० 70 पैसे कर दी गई, जिस पर दिल्ली ऐडमिनिस्ट्रेशन का कन्ट्रोल होता है। इसी तरह से मैदा का दाम 41 पैसे किलो बढ़ा दिया गया । चीनी का दाम 10/- किलो, वह भी नहीं मिल रही है । गरीब आदमी ने चीनी खाना ही छोड़ दिया ।

अध्यक्ष महोदय, मैं आपके माध्यम से कहना चाहता हूं भारत की प्रधान मंत्री के लिये हिन्दुस्तान के गरीब गुरबा सब इनके लिये, यदि यह नेता हैं तो, सब इनके लड़के के समान हैं। इसलिए इनको चाहिये, इनके सामने सिर्फ एक आदमी का चेहरा नहीं रहना चाहिए, बल्कि देश का चेहरा रहना चाहिये। 52 प्रतिशत देश की जनता मांग करती रही है कि मंडल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट आ गयी है, काका कालेलकर कमीशन तो खत्म हुआ, वह तो गर्त में चला गया, लेकिन मंडल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट जो आयी है उसको लागू करें। लेकिन गृह मंत्री जी ने जवाब क्या दिया कि ओपीनियन के लिये भेज रहे हैं पूरे देश की ओपीनियन जानने के लिये । मंडल जी मर गये, उन्होंने सारे राजनीतिक नेताओं से, इंटलेक्चुअल्स और प्रेस वालों की राय ली उसके बाद अपनी रिपोर्ट दी फिर अब क्या नई ओपीनियन आप ले रहे हैं ? क्या भारत की प्रधान मंत्री कह सकती है कि हिन्दुस्तान के बहुसंख्यकों का आदर करते हुए मंडल कमीशन की रिपोर्ट को आप लागू करेंगी? और जैसा मैंने कहा, आपको चाहिये मां का रोल अदा करना । और शाह कमीशन के सामने जो कहा गया था आपके सामने यह फिकर नहीं रहनी चाहिये ।

**मैं कहना चाहता हूं, भारत की प्रधान मंत्री. . . .

(व्यवधान)

MR SPEAKER: Irrelevant talk. No more. Please wind up.

(*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER: Mr Kusuma Krishna Murthy. I have called Mr. Krishna Murthy.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : यह लोग गड़बड़ कर रहे हैं... (व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप बैठिए।

I have called Mr Krishna Murthy. Please sit down.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: It should be expunged. It should not go on record.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : आप इनको नहीं रोकते हैं। मैं अकेला हूं और यह सब मिल कर बोल रहे हैं।...

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : कोई ढंग की बात करें I did not expect this kind of thing from you. I wanted something better. This will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

Please sit down. What is this?

Please, Order. Please keep silent.

(*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER: It is all right. Enough of it. It is enough.

(*Interruptions*)

AN HON. MEMBER: What is your ruling? Have you expunged those remarks?

MR. SPEAKER: I have already done it.

(*Interruptions*)

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि अगर कोई अन पार्लियामेन्टरी...

(व्यवधान)

सूचना और प्रसारण मंत्री (श्री बसन्त साठे) : इतना नीचे उतर सकते हो ?

(व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: You sit down.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : अध्यक्ष महोदय,

SHRI EDUARDO FALEIRO (Mormugao): Have you expunged those remarks?

MR SPEAKER: I have done it already.

(*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER: Please keep up some standards. I expected something better from you, not like this. I want some standard of this debate to be maintained. Don't debase it.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : मैं इतना ही कहना चाहता हूं कि मुझे कोई बुरी नियत नहीं है। मैं इतना ही सिर्फ कहना चाहता था कि प्रधान मंत्री के प्रति आपको जितनी श्रद्धा है, दूसरों को भी है। बात यह है कि आज जो आप ओबजेक्शन उठा रहे हैं, यह बात तो आलरेडी रिकार्ड पर है।...

(व्यवधान)

MR. SPEAKER: I have already given my ruling. You sit down.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : जिस बात को मैंने कहा है, मैं वापिस लेता हूं, लेकिन इसके पहले यह दोनों सदनों में कहा जा चुका है, यह लोग उस समय कहां बैठे थे? यह बात रिकार्ड पर है, आज आप इसका विरोध करते हैं। मैंने रिकार्ड से...

(व्यवधान)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : आप मतलब की बात हो तो कहें ।

Otherwise, I am going to make you stop.

श्री राम विलास पासवान : इस देश में गरीब आज ज्यादा हैं मैं आपसे कहना चाहता हूं कि आज का जो नो कांफीडेंस मोशन है, उसके माध्यम से मैं सरकार से आग्रह करना चाहता हूं और प्रधान मंत्री से कहना चाहता हूं कि आपने रिजल्ट देख लिया है और यदि आगे भविष्य में नहीं चेता तो भले ही यहां वोट से आप जीत जायें, लेकिन आगे आने वाले समय में 1985 में समय आपको माफ नहीं करेगा ।

इन शब्दों के साथ मैं अपनी बात समाप्त करता हूं ।

SHRI KUSUMA KRISHNA MURTHY (Amalapuram): Mr Speaker, Sir, I would like to only deal with some of the basic issues raised by Mr Ram Vilas Paswan. He accused the Government that atrocities on Harijans have increased: the welfare of minorities and weaker sections has been neglected and so on and so forth. I would like to ask my hon. friend one important question: During which regime the largest number of atrocities were committed on Harijans? The largest number of atrocities were committed on Harijans only during the Janata regime when they were in power. More than 10,000 cases of atrocities committed were during 1978-79. Therefore ever since this Government came into power under the leadership of Mrs Gandhi, they have been contained and brought down systematically.

Another important thing that I would like to ask him is, whenever and wherever this kind of atrocities were committed who visited those places? It is only Mrs. Gandhi who visited them, comforted them, listened to their grievances and tried to solve heir problem.

Again, one more thing I would like to ask my hon. friend that when they were sitting on the Treasury Benches and I was sitting on the other side, at that time, one important issue came before the House.

That was the reservation Bill coming to a close as it was getting lapsed. At that time, I requested those of my hon'ble friends to prevail upon their Government to get the Reservation extended. They could not be successful. They could not impress upon their Government which was in power at that time.

Only when Mrs. Gandhi came to power, the first piece of legislation brought into force by this Government was the Reservation Bill which was passed in January 1980.

Apart from that, for the first time in history of this country, there was a special component plan, specially enacted for the betterment of the scheduled castes, specially allocating about Rs. 1,000 crores for the welfare of these people. It was brought into enactment and it was being implemented. This was done under the administration of this Government.

They might all laugh on these claims but when the question of practice comes, there is a dismal failure from their side.

In the present situation of political disintegration, we are seeing a new kind of political situation wherein it is found a leader without followers and followers without a leader!

This is the situation and there are also parties with only one or two M.Ps!

And above all, the Hon. Member who moved this no confidence motion, I think, he has no confidence in himself! Otherwise, he would have asked to resign these hon'ble Members of Parliament who are still continuing here and were elected in the name of Mrs. Gandhi and for whom he claims to be the leader and if he has any sense of confidence, he would have asked them to resign as soon as he resigned. That he has not done. And apart from this ....

(Interruptions)

The opposition is trying to give an impression to the whole nation by bringing this no-confidence motion that they are united and committed to voice the aspirations of the people....

(*Interruptions*)

And they want to show the outside world and say that "we are united and committed to voice the aspirations of the people". Quite interestingly, the people outside this House know pretty well that there are the new political alignments taking place among strange bed-fellows. even here if they have forgotten what they did against each other and also what they said against each other people have not forgotten about them. The people know everything about the new political alignment now with those leaders coming closer and closer and also people know pretty well, how long this political alignment lasts. The opposition wanted to say to the word or to the country at large that they are united and committed to voice the aspirations of the people but the people know that they are not united and they are not committed to any ideology at all at any stage.

Many issues have been raised about poverty against which everything has been clearly clarified by those who spoke from our side.

One important thing that Government has done is containing inflation. When compared to other nations, our performance is quite remarkable. When compared to 21.4 per cent inflation in 1979-80 and when it was brought to 2.1 per cent in 1982 it was a remarkable achievement. In this respect, I would like my friends to understand one important aspect. With a country of our size which has more than 711 million population with different languages, different religions, castes and communities, is it not fortunate that we have a unifying force in the person of Mrs. Gandhi who can command respect and faith of South India as well as North India equally and can any leaders understand the special problems of South India or at least can they recognise the differences among the Southern languages? Therefore, these leaders are only regional leaders and can never claim to be national leaders.

Before concluding, I would like to say one more thing. No less a person than the Prime Minister of Japan — he is not a Congress-I man — has paid a glowing tribute to the leadership of Mrs. Gandhi saying that she is not only the leader of India and Asia but of the world. Is it not a pride to our country and to her party and to her Government?

With these words, I strongly oppose the no-confidence motion which has been brought here out of frustration.

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Mr. Speaker, Sir, many people from our side have rightly said that this question of bringing a no-confidence motion has become a routine matter, but they have failed to follow it up by saying that every time it is we who come up on top, not because of numbers because of the effectiveness of the replies given to the points made by the opposition. No new point has been raised in today's debate that has not been discussed in this very Session and which has not been replied to during question hour and on other occasions time and again. Therefore, what was the point of raising them all over again. That point was answered by the last speaker from the Opposition Benches. It is personal animosity. He brought personal animosity into the debate, he tried to bring my family into it, even my small grand-children. Is this Parliamentary democracy? (*Interruptions*) Does it show decency? This was his major and most-loudly-made point. This shows what his interest lies in. Earlier and before that, as my hon. colleague, Mr. Venkataraman aptly pointed out, when very serious matters were being debated in the House, the hon. Opposition leaders and Members did not consider it worth their while, did not consider those matter important enough for them to be present in the House, and now suddenly they see them as important enough to censure the Government on. We can withstand their censure, we have faced their censure, we have stood the censure of the world on many important matters. We have stood, as I said in America and everywhere. I have gone and as I shall continue to state, we have stood upright in spite of our opponents or what Opposition Members say.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

It would have been more appropriate if the hon. Members had moved a vote of no-confidence in themselves. (*Interruptions*) For once at least they would have got the credit of recognising the realities of the situation.

I do not think that the facts of their criticism about one another are hidden from us on this side or the opposite side or from the world at large. The last Member who spoke belongs to the real, *asli* Lok Dal, the other are *nakali* ones; and yet here they have got together! Those who have been the very perpetrators of such emotions accuse us of casteism and communalism, not just from today but since before independence. Then there are those who consider themselves progressive. What are they doing? They are very proudly saying, "We do not associate ourselves with such people." What are you doing on this occasion? What have you done in the elections, I ask you? You have not stood alone. You have supported reactionary elements outside and inside the House on every possible occasion. (*Interruptions*)

A respected and a known Marxist leader has said, we shall support the BJP, "we shall accept the support of the BJP, if this defeats Indira Gandhi". This was printed in all the newspapers. (*Interruptions*) Do not make a noise here.

SHRI SATYASADHAN CHAKRABORTY (Calcutta South): It was against authoritarianism and we shall fight it (*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You have their version here also. Therefore, they consider the BJP and the RSS as good allies. It is not only I who am saying this. Your member himself has just admitted it—the CPM member.... (*Interruptions*) I am not yielding to you. Please sit down.

They are slinging mud against one another. The various groups, the BJP, the various segments of the LDs, the CPI-M, and the DSP, all these have throughout been indulging in mudslinging. This does not prevent them from joining hands to try to weaken the Government—not that they can replace it. They have no positive programme. They have no positive policy. What is the use of speaking of ideology? If one Opposition party has a programme, the other has a diametrically opposed one and the third persons goes in yet another direction. That is not called a programme. It just means destruction of the solidarity of our people. It means the destruction of the unity of our country. That is what you are out to do. You may refute it until you are blue in the face. but you cannot convince anybody. This fact the world has recognised. I happen to be in touch with world leaders, with the leaders of the countries which some Members opposite support and the country's which the rest of them support. I happen to know what they think of India.... (*Interruptions*)

Today every country in the world is impressed by our basic policies and the manner in which we are implementing them. Every country, I repeat, from the developing world, the developed world, the Communist world and the capitalist world. There must be something good in what we are doing, that such very diverse elements have come to praise us, personally by talking or writing to me but speaking at public places, in their own news- Janata Party or Lok Dal Government...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Diplomacy demands it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Why have they not done it to you? Why have they not done it to other people? You have only to hear what was said in the non-aligned movement during the Janata Party or Lok Dal Government....

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: They have given us the same.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You have now the temerity to suggest and alleged that we are compromising ourselves on self-reliance. You have the temerity to say this to Indira Gandhi?...when I have stood for the honour of the country— (*Interruptions*) yes, what is the use of saying 'Oh?'—Yes, I am... (*Interruptions*)

SHRI HARIKESH BAHADUR: You are destroying.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am destroying it? ....(*Interruptions*) The world knows when India's strength has been built, the world knows when India's honour has been upheld. It is not a question of shouting in this House, whether our side does it or your side does it. The world knows it and the world has acknowledged it. The fact is that they have acknowledged some Members who accuse me, are those who have strongly opposed the policies of the Congress and of Jawarlal Nehru to build up our own economic strength, to have economic planning and to improve our industry and agriculture.

There are many who have constantly propagated that it is better for us to belong to en bloc or another. Today they seem to have changed. I am sorry to say I find it most difficult to believe in them when I know how long they have held other views.

Self-reliance has been, is and will always remain our basic objective. Especially this month of August brings back heroic memories of the Quit India Movement. There were some even then who did not want the country to stand for Independence but were serving the cause of the colonial masters. There are some who are sitting opposite who even when we become independent, said that we were stooges of the British. Don't make me repeat all this because it is all down in black and white.

Today, our technology has gained immense strength. For its own good, we have to go in for more advanced technology in some fields. Otherwise, we shall be struck with obsolete methods in a world that is fast changing and fast moving., We are not throwing open our entire economy to the foreign investment but only those segments which will increase our expertise and bring the sophisticated knowhow of which we are in need.

A great deal has been said about Tarapur. Now, I think an adequate reply was given. However, I should like to clarify once more that during the discussion with the U.S. Delegation in India and in U.S.A. between our officials, we made our position amply clear and also in other forums regarding—(a) the right to reprocess without further consultation and (b) on the expiry of the agreement, and allights and obligations arising out of this in 1993. Both sides agreed that, in spite of the differences of opinion on these two issues, arrangements for continued supply of enriched uranium to India within the framework of the 1963 agreement could be made and, therefore, it was decided to accept the offer of supplies through France. Because, earlier there was uncertainty in the supply of fuel by the U.S.A., we had to think of some alternative method. Development work was carried out and the use of MOX as an alternative fuel was found feasible. The work on this technological achievement will be continued. I have stated this in this House on an earlier occasion also. I could read a much longer note but I do not want to take the time of the House. But, I repeat that the use of MOX" in the future for the Tarapur Atomic Power Station is not precluded.

Sir, much has been said about the Bihar Press Bill. I am not going into the matter except to reiterate that we stand committed to a free press. But, as the Press Commission has deserved, the Press has to be not only free but responsible — responsible not to the Government but to the consequences of whatever they write or publish. As has been said, in fact, somebody has sent me a quotation, "nobody is entitled to use his freedom of speech and expression to injure another's reputation" (*Interruptions*) I have no doubt that the senior professionals in the Press itself will not approve of the untruth or obscenity that are sometimes indulged in by the less responsible sections of the Press. How should this be dealt with is a matter which can be discussed and which can be gone into. But, as has been pointed out, this is not a new idea. A very similar act was passed earlier by two States. So far as I remember. I did not hear much noise about it, either here or outside, from those who were in power then.

Sir, a lot of people have made much about the elections. I have not got all the figures about the last elections. But,

[Smt. Indira Gandhi]

I can say that in Haryana, in 1977, we had 17.15 per cent of the votes; in the Lok Sabha elections in 1980, we had 35 per cent and, in the Assembly Elections in 1982, we had 38 per cent.

If the weaker sections which are the vast majority of the population did not support us, how is it that we were able to get such a majority? Was it by the support of the big houses that we are two-thirds of us here? (*Interruptions*) Such a remark, Sir, is an insult not to me or to any of us, but it is an insult to the electorate of India and the many millions of people who voted.

Chaudhary Charan Singhji....

एक माननीय सदस्य : वे चले गये ।

श्रीमती इंदिरा गांधी : वे चले भी गए हां, लेकिन उन्होंने पावर्टी की बात की थी ।

Our differences with him are of long standing; they are basic. I do not want to bring them out in the open. But one of the questions which he used to raise with me during my earlier regime, when I was Prime Minister and he the Chief Minister of UP, was that we should close down the mills, specially the textile mills. It is for the House to consider whether that policy is viable in any modern country. I myself put the question to him: "What are we going to do with all the industrial workers, who will be dislodged?" He said, "You will have to get them to make handloom material." Hon'ble members can also consider if that is a possibility? Will that supply enough cloth at reasonable prices and in time to the huge population of India? I am mentioning only one item to show the trend of Chaudhuri Sahib's thinking on many such matters.

He also gave certain statistics. I do not blame him for using them very selectively, meant only to serve his own thesis. He said nothing at all about the overall increase in grain output, increase in sugar and milk products. I can give figures of the record foodproduction; in 1981-82, it was 132 million tonnes, oilseeds in 1981-82—115 lakh tonnes; sugarcane 180 million tonnes, milk production—33 million tonnes as against 17 million tonnes in 1951. I could have given many other statistics, I am cutting short the list. There are other items with which the smaller man is concerned, that is the production of eggs, fish etc. In all these production has augmented tremendously. And obviously, the gain will go to private persons, these are not State ventures; but of small farmers, and sometimes even the landless people.

There was also talk about poverty line. I should like to make clear that I have never said that we have conquered poverty or eliminated poverty. On the contrary, I have said that there is poverty, and that in my generation, we shall not be able to remove it. I have made that very clear, as long back as when I came to power in 1966. It is an enormously big problem. What I have said is that the face of poverty is changing. What I have said is, and it is true, that many millions of people have been raised above what was considered the poverty line earlier on. And that line is a shifting line. At that time what was considered luxuries by the people, are today necessities. we do not blame them; we agree with them.

At the same time, the question of population increase must also be taken into consideration. Life expectancy has gone up. I am sorry, I do not agree with Shri Chavan's theory although I know that the Congress itself has used the phrase. The rich are richer, I agree but the poor are not poorer. They are poorer by contrast, they are poorer because they are more conscious of poverty, but they are not poorer in the sense that I with my own eyes have seen at the time of independence, that I with my own eyes have seen, even when I became Prime Minister in 1966. I do not live in a village; I do not know whether Chaudhuri Charan Singh himself lives in one. However, since I was a small child, villagers have been

coming to my home not in hundreds, but in thousands and in lakhs. Whether in Anand Bhawan. Allahabad, in Teen Murti House, 1, Safdarjung Road or in 12, Willingdon Crescent, the house and the compound have been full of villagers from all parts of the country not always from my part, not always those who sympathise with me. Perhaps the Hon. Members would be interested to know that at the time when Choudhury Charan Singh had his Kisan Rally in Delhi a large number of farmers turned up at my house. They told me: 'We have come for the Kisan Rally' and one of the inducements given to some of them was that 'you will have Indira Gandhi's *darshan*, when you come to Delhi'.

(Interruptions)

While we are on this subject and because Shri and Shrimati Dandavate are both present, I can bring to the notice of this House an incident which took place only a few days ago. Prof. Madhu Dandavate was a Minister in the Janata Party Government, but at that time he was not bothered about the people of Belgaum or about the border issue. Now, he and Mrs. Dandavate brought quite a crowd said to be from Belgaum. What was he doing when he was a Minister for two and a half years? "हमको तो आप ही में श्रद्धा है, आपही इस प्रश्न को सुलझाएंगी." they said, not behind Prof. Dandavate's back but in front of them. He also used similar words!

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Sir, I told her that when we were in power we convened a meeting, but unfortunately the Parliament was dissolved. I told this to her and I repeat it here.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Sir, so far as the poverty line is concerned, in absolute terms the number of people below the poverty line has increased because there has been 90 per cent increase in population. However, in percentage terms the number has come down. It has declined from 51.49 per cent in 1972-73 to 48.13 per cent in 1977, and it is constantly declining. I am told that by the completion of the Sixth Five-Year Plan, we will be able to take some millions of people, over 10 crores perhaps above the poverty line.

So far as drinking water is concerned, the target under the 20-point programme is to cover all problem villages by 1985. 6,266 problem villages have been covered in the first quarter of 1982. This represents 20.2 per cent of the annual target. We hope to achieve the target by 1985.

Sombody also accused us of not dealing with this problem seriously. It is a sad commentary, but in many villages, in fact, in most villages, people seem to prefer to have a big unit or project rather than something which is so essential as drinking water or a primary school. I myself have had discussions sometimes' with villagers trying to persuade them about urgent priority items, but they seem to prefer to have a prestigious project. So, we have to fight for this also.

Then there are land reforms. I don't want to go into the figures, but perhaps you know—this is as true of West Bengal as of other places—how many stay orders there are and cases that are stuck in the courts. This is true not only of land reforms, but of many other programmes which concern the poorest and the weaker sections. In this we are helpless. Unless we can all sit together and find some way, we cannot do anything.

AN HON. MEMBER: Why don't you bring it under the Ninth Schedule?

AN HON. MEMBER. They are under the Ninth Schedule. You don't know.

(Interruptions)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I do not have the full figures here of the convinction of the accused but so far as the atrocities on the Scheduled Castes are concerned,—I speak subject to correction because I am not sure whether all these towns are in Bihar, Belchi, Pipra and Bishenpur, in six places—there have been two death sentences and 135 life

[Smt. Indira Gandhi]

sentences and in other States also there have been some. I do not have all the figures with me.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: What about Meenakshipuram and Arab money?

AN HON. MEMBER: You have taken charge of it.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Now, with regard to employment, I have spoken on this matter earlier also. The figures that are on our registers are not always accurate. Many people who are unemployed do not register, many who are employed do register either to get a better job or to get a job in another part of the country. I have myself seen some of these figures. In spite of this, the rate of increase has declined from 16 per cent in 1978 to 13 per cent in 1979 and 1980 and has further declined to 10 per cent in 1981. By and large, about 50 per cent of the job seekers belong to the educated category. But even here, the rate of increase of unemployment has shown a downward trend. I should like to point out, as I had done before, that a lasting solution to the problem of unemployment can only depend on the level and rate of growth of the economy and that is why we lay so much stress on increasing production and on development programmes. That is the only way in which a long term solution can be found. We have got short term schemes; some of them are successful, some, I am sorry to say, are not succeeding. But the only way is really to get on with development and for hon. Members opposite not to try to obstruct us in that important task.

DR. SUBRAMANIAM SWAMY: We are insignificant.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: The other point to which my attention has been drawn is that the proper index of our effort is the rate at which the total national income at constant prices has increased. India's GNP at constant prices has nearly trebled in the 30 years since we have started our economic planning; our domestic product grew up by an average of 3.7 per cent year during the years 1970 to 1978 and this performance was better than the majority of the advanced countries even.

Sir, we believe in and are fully committed to the demorcatic system. However, I must confess that I have some reservations about the present functioning of Parliament. Choudhary Charan Singh himself has spoken of the lengthening of the 'Zero Hour' and earlier I quoted my honourable colleagues, as to how little interest is shown in serious subjects and how much time goes on other subjects repeated over and over again. They may be important subjects; but when they have been replied to and you reiterate them, that does not lead to any solution. (*Interruptions*)

Mention also was made about blindings in Bhagalpur. That has been very barbarous and inhuman. I can hardly find words to describe the horror of it. But I should like to remind you that it started in the Janata Party period and it also took place in the Marxists' time in West Bengal, which by the way, was loudly denied from the opposite side when the fact was first made known, although later it was admitted by the West Bengal Government.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: Do not blind them with retropective effect!

SHRIMATI INDIRA GADHNI: It was raised, that is why, I am speaking of it. Otherwise, I would not have talked of the subject.

Since we were on the question of this raising of a hue and cry in the House I might say that the economic figures regarding West Bengal which we gave were loudly protested and denied by the Marxist Party during the elections. After the elections, they admited that they had been misled and that the figures that we had quoted were correct.

20 hrs.

SHRI SOMNATH CHATTERJEE: Which figures?

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Economic figures. (*Interruptions*)

It is refreshing but not really believable that the Bharatiya Janata Party, the Jansangh, the RSS—whatever name you want to give it I consider them to be one and the same—pretend to take a different stance. With all humility I say that these are just tactics. There is no reality in this difference of opinion between the BJP and the RSS. That they have suddenly come to believe in the concept of self-reliance or of economic planning or of non-alignment, I find it very difficult to believe. What did they do? What steps did they take towards self-reliance, towards socialism when they were in power? Most of the Members opposite—I am sorry to say—become pastmasters in destructive tactics for their own ends. At that time the destruction was not against us; it was only amongst themselves; but it was destruction nevertheless.

So far as prices in Delhi are concerned, I am not going into the whole question of prices here. But I do want to take this opportunity of saying that Government is taking special measures to ensure increased supplies of essential commodities in Delhi, in the Delhi market especially during the ASIAD, so as to prevent prices going up to a significant extent.

Now, my hon. friend Shri Sathe will excuse me if I say a word about him, because several people have quoted from his speech. His own thinking has been largely, if not entirely these days, confined to the question of colour TV. And it is true that he felt that we are not giving that issue he thought that it deserves. This is all that he meant by his long speech. I must confess that I am not against colour TV. The question is one of priority. My priority in radio and TV is to reach the largest number of villages possible. And we feel that we cannot do this with colour TV. We do not want to stop colour TV and we have begun it. But we feel that it is easier and cheaper to cover the country with black and white. If we can do it cheaply with colour TV, certainly we shall do so. We do not want to lag behind other countries and especially our neighbours. At this moment, this poses a serious problem. In the border areas, people like to switch on to colour programmes from other countries rather than to see our own black and white. This is a very real problem which we have all to face.

Some people have said that the 20-Point Programme is not new. We never said that it was. We have called it the revised 20-Point Programme. It was revised because some of the points have been completed and because we wanted to direct our attention and energies to the gaps and the most urgent problems which remain.

Some hon. Members fell that any time anybody mentions the name of the Soviet Union, they have to rush to its defence. I think the Soviet Union is quite capable of defending itself. It can do without help from this quarter. (*Interruptions*) I do not think that Shri Gadgil meant in any way to denigrate the Soviet Union. He was referring to the news that has appeared in newspapers in many countries that the USSR is short of grain not only for cattle but wheat for human beings also. This is not a cause for blame because, so much depends on rain. Shri Gadgil just stated a fact which he had read. To interpret it as casting aspersions on a friendly country would be wrong, and even an unfriendly act towards that country.

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: It is the habit of your people.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: It is your habit also. Why do you want to be so touchy on that account?

SHRI INDRAJIT GUPTA: You are more touchy.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not touchy, because I know they can defend themselves.. (*Interruptions*) You sit down.

[Shrimati Indira Gandhi]

Some other members have made all kinds of insinuations. I do not wish to take the names of the hon. Members, but I can only say that it was the vilest possible insinuation to say that the Centre, or the Union Government, gives instructions for any or every Bill, or that all actions are referred to me or to anybody who is not directly concerned.

I am not concerned with what words were used in my Manipur case. But even if you say—I am not admitting it at all for I do not want to start a new argument; even if I were merely summoned there as a witness, is it not a ridiculous charge to summon a former Prime Minister, abetting the stealing of two chickens and six eggs? That is the question which I want to ask...(*Interruptions*)

Sir, the opposition cannot have it both ways. On the one hand, they say I am a dictator, I do not allow anybody to function, I do not allow anybody to speak; on the other hand, they say that people are doing things without asking me, things are happening in Bihar, things are happening in Delhi, without my being aware of them! You cannot have it both ways. You choose which you want and stick to that point of view...(*Interruptions*)

I should like to ask; which Communist country or which Fascist country has democracy? Perhaps you would like to answer that question...(*Interruptions*) I do not know if Mr. Vajpayee will agree with that.

I charge this opposition...(*Interruptions*) I am just finishing. I charge this opposition with irresponsibility; I charge this opposition with utter disregard for the norms of democracy; I charge this opposition with wasting the time of this hon. House; I charge them wasting the money of the exchequer; I charge them with lack of concern for important legislation. Just measure the time spent on actual legislation or discussion on important issues now facing us and the world with the time spent on shouting, whether it is in 'zero hour' or on other occasions...(*interruptions*)

In the beginning, not a voice used to be heard from our side. Only when we discovered that by keeping quiet the opposite would not allow us to function only then our people started shouting. If the opposition guarantees to keep quiet, I guarantee that not a word will come from our members. Are you prepared to listen to that? Are you going to control your motley crowd there? I charge this so-called. Left of the country for so completely abandoning its principles and ideals and for selling out to the right reactionaries...(*Interruptions*)

A couple of speeches—(*Interruptions*). I am not yielding, I am not yielding.

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI (Patna): We are also not yielding.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: A couple of speeches or demonstrations make no difference, nor do they form a policy. Those who are concerned with progressive policies all over the world are aware of this betrayal by the Indian Left. (*Interruptions*).

Sir, I should like to remaind the House of the early days or Hilter in Germany, when the West was content to encourage him because he was supposed to crush communism and in that process millions of people in Germany, in Austria, in Czechoslavakia, Poland and other countries were tortured and massacred in the most barbarous manner imaginable and the entire world was engulfed in World War II. Today, the so-called Left forces in India are supporting the BJP and RSS and strengthening them in the hope, they are giving it respect in the hope....(*Interruptions*). I shall keep on repeating till you sit.

AN HON. MEMBER: We are not yielding.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You have had your say.

The left are giving the reactionaries respectability, they are strengthening them

in the hope that this will weaken and, if possible, destroy the Congress, the Party which brought Independence to India, the Party which brought honour and progress, which is trying against tremendous odds to retain.... (*Interruptions*) the Party which is trying against tremendous odds to retain our culture and at the same time modernising the country and bringing a better life to millions of our people, specially the weaker and under-privileged sections.

Sir, I should like to ask: How many voices were raised in the Opposition when one of its Members openly and gleefully declared himself to be an agent of the CIA? How did the Oppositon react when one of its Members gave information to a foreign embassy? Does this bring honour to the country? Whatever its faults, the Congress—and the Congress does have faults because we also are human, we are not super human, we do have faults, but the Congress always has risen and always will rise to the challenge.

Hon. Members of the Opposition have brought this Motion to empty their ammunition. They have been poor marksmen and their ammunition was drmp and stale. Little damage has been done except that the valuable time of the House has been spent on issues which have been discussed many times before

I ask the hon. Member to withdraw his Motion and if he does not do so, I request you all to defeat it strongly.

(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER:Mr. Bahuguna.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU (Chagalpattu): I am on a point of order. While moving the Motion Shri Bahuguna said....

SHRI RAMAVATAR SHASTRI: Under what rule? (*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: I am on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: No point of order. Please sit down. I have over-ruled. Shri Bahuguna.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI ERA ANBARASU: Please listen to me.

MR. SPEAKER: No, no. Please sit down. Not allowed. I am not allowing. Whatever he says will not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)

अध्यक्ष महोदय : बागड़ी जी, आप कहना क्या चाहते हैं ?

श्री मनीराम बागड़ी : सदन को यह मालुम होना चाहिए कि माननीय सदस्य क्या रखने आये थे ।

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed. I have over-ruled everything. How can you do it?

(*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER I have not allowed. I have allowed Shri Bahuguna.

SHRI H.N. BAHUGUNA: The debate which we started this morning has ended with general type of enunciations by the Prime Minister. Her speech is couched in good language, high sounding phrases, but has no concrete content in it. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: It is all right. Well you keep silent.

SHRI H.N. BAHUGUNA: I was little surprised about the excitement that this debate caused her. She spoke more in anger than with reason. Therefore, I have nothing to say as far as she goes, for the Prime Minister did not answar a single question. (*Interruptions*) Nor did the Prime Minster while talking about Tarapur answar my two specific questions:

**Not recorded.

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna]

1. Whether spares will be available as and when necessary and on some schedule to be followed; and

(*Interruptions*)

yes, it is on the record.

2. The spent fuel storage capacity is already now over-flowing. What will happen to it unless we start re-processing the fuel?

She has again make a general statement. She said, we shall be "re-processing"?. Which year of time? She has not been able to say exactly, nor has she given any indirect indication thereof.

She talked about self-reliance. And she said and as far as I think she reminds us of herself, as if it was the surest guarantee on that score. Sir, with due apology to her, may I submit that when she was speaking, it looked as if Narci was talking about himself. She was talking, probably, more about herself than about her Party of India. She told the House: As long as Indira Gandhi is there interest of the nation is safe in every possible direction. . .Now, we know, as long as Indira Gandhi is there the claim will be loud but results will be poor. She talked about milk. Right now, a couple of weeks ago, a month ago, some months ago, even last year, and this financial year, they went for purchase of butter, asking for milk and butter to feed the four metropolitan towns. And they are still in different European countries against for both butter and milk. Nevertheless, I do not want to go into statistics of the whole matter. But the point is very simple. Is this really the way, one should specially the P.M. deal with a debate of this nature? My hon friends, the Prime Minister has not responded to specifics but she charged that we in the opposition speak with different voices. She charged that we are "motley crowd." She charged that we belong to different political parties. Of course, we are all of different political hues and colours But one point, we are all united. As she said from the ramparts of Red Fort yesterday, in the case of defence of the country the whole country gets united. Does she of that point to time say, Mr. Vajpayee, I shall not touch you, you smell of RSS connections? Now, we are in a similar position. Democracy is being eroded, Parliamentary democracy is in danger of being eroded. (*Interruptions*) It is not a question of our siding with R.S.S. We represent in many cases; absolutely different views as also on so many questions. But if all are one on the question of self-reliance, or shall we say on the Tarapur deal what is wrong about it? Why didnt the Prime Minister take Dr. Sethna with her in her American tour? She could take every possible and conceivable person including hon. Member of Parliament, Shri Rajiv Gandhi. Why could not she think of Dr. Sethna, the man who is in charge of Atomic Energy? If she has no trust in him, I do not mind if she removes that man. But as long as he is the Chairman of. .

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN: He cannot give name now. Ample opportunity he has already got earlier.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Because it was done earlier; the matter was decided before I left, in which Dr. Sethna was fully consulted.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Sir, all I want to say is that in a matter of such importance, critical importance to the national defence and power sector and the nations entire future programme depends on it. The Prime Minister herself said, mountain can be moved in no time, the whole area of atomic energy can be used for peaceful purposes. We will take less time in building our reservoirs and we can do so many things if we have atomic capability. The man who in charge of this department is not there. In such a critical area the man in charge, Dr. Sethna is not included in her team.

In any case, then she has not a word to say how good the French capability is in supplying the fuel we need. As Dr. Subramaniam Swamy said, France is a member of the London Club. The London Club met immediately in the wake of the Pokhran "Explosion" or whatever you may call it, in the nature of things. Now, at that

particular meeting every country and all nuclear powers were there in the "London Club". The London Club conditions by which France is bound, are much more harder. In a way the schemes of 1963 Treaty have been knocked out by one single act of this Govenmment of India in agreeing to let the Treaty be diluted because, I know, Sir, the Ruling Party, as I said, are going round the globe with a beggar bowl in their hand. Whatever they are claiming today, they cannot run this country except of loans and grants. They have chosen the capitalist path and the capitalist path is such that Rajasthan Canal story is our greatest shame. What a state of condition is there? I can give you one example. In China, one canal equal to first phase of Rajasthan Canal was built in 80 days. Our country has taken such a long time. That is a dictatorship; you are a democracy. You could have built it in 800 days or 80x108,000 days or even 10 years. For 11 years, she was the Prime Minister. She could not complete even the Rajasthan Canal.

My point is, whereas self-reliance is being talked of, we have been mortgaged both in the power sector and in the sector of these consumption loans for which we have become dependent on others. So far as my hon. friend, Mr. Pranab Mukherjee and others are concerned. I would only say that he can read my speech over again. I have accounted for 30 per cent Reserve Bank security obligation on Banks. But. the headings, the words and the nomenclatures are those which are used by the Reserve Bank itself. "Outflow of funds is the expression used by the Reserve Bank itself. It is used by them, not by me. If he feels the repression needs correction but cannot correct his own Bank reporting, I cannot correct that. I can tell him, district by district, how things are being done to the detriment of backward areas and poor people. Credit squeeze has been evenly put on the whole country. It applies to the poor hill people of Uttar Pradesh and the backward regions in Konkan area or Bastar. To a man who wants to purchase chesis, the Bank will not give any advance money, as they used to give before, after the IMF loan was introduced. Credit sequeeze was not inducted industry-wise; it was not applied setoral area-wise. It was applied in a blind manner, "Thou shall not give the loans beyond this limit" across the Board as they call it. These are the conditions. It is not only one bad condition imposed on us by IMF. The other one is, "Thou shall not take more loans than this limit within or without the country." If you still feel self-reliant, if you still feel you are standing on your own legs, you are welcome to live in a world of your own make-believe. Mr. Pranab Mukherjee told us how he wants to meet the expenditure on debt sedvice charges. His remedy is simple. He said something about increase in the exports and pay back by earning more. But where is the hope for such a feat. Now, I will give him one small information. On the shipping side, just recently under the leadership of the Shipping Corporation of India, the shipping interestes went to Japan to discuss with Japan about the carriage of cargo in our naional bottoms. But our deligation drew almost a blank. Many countries have put such a condition. Even a country like the Philipines, even a country like Indonesia, even a country like Argentina, even aiso a country like USA, has put a condition that exports/imports from it shall be carried upto 50 per cent in its national bottoms. Rs. 1500 crores worth foreign exchange outflow on this account is there. Should you enforce condition on your shipping area you will be saving more than Rs. 500 crores of foreign exchange on the existing capacity.

If we had decided under the Sixth Plan, as envisaged, to increase our own capacity of the shipping Corporation and take it to a reasonable level, India can earn more and save more foreign exchange. Half the time of the Sixth Plan period has gone. What the government have done is only to help the Apeejay and the "surrender to Surendra" is what they have done. That famous 'Pal' who arranges parties and meetings in Great Britain to Congress(I) leader and that famous company, a small tiny tot, has been given almost 40 per cent of the total sums of money that were kept in this account from which the shipping industry is given loans on sabsidised terms.

Sir, when I started the debate, I thought that we will keep the level of the debate to a level where we shall be able to make a positive contribution. But my hope have

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna]

been belied by the "no-contribution" made by the ruling party

It is 2-1/2 years after the General Elections and we are meeting after the mini-General Election. Government are completing 31 months of their regime. When you stopped hearing, you remember, from 1975 onwards, when you closed your eyes and ears, when you did not let even the press speak, the parties speak, when the whole country was driven dumb, the result was that when the day of reckonning came you were also dumped. In 1977, you were in the dump. You are heading towards that situation; your party is heading towards that situation; again.. (*Interruptions*) I can only caution you; I can only warn you. As I cautioned you as I warned you before, I can raise only my finger. I will continue to raise it. I may be a small man. But I also had my part in the freedom struggle. It is nobody's monopoly to say, "I have taken part in the freedom struggle." He who has been one-fourth of the time in Jail compared to me cannot claim to have more interest in the ethos of freedon struggle and claim to speak more for it than myself.

People are taking credit today about their having met the far away villagers. Yes, I also come from a village. I live with villagers I have been in the village. Everybody was..........

THE PRIME MINISTER (SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI): Which village?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: After I moved the motion of no confidence, my Hon. friend Mr. Vidya Charan Shukla put it on a very high personal key. He talked everything about myself. And I am happy that he had nothing to say against what I had said on the state of the health of the nation. When Shri Charan Singh talked about me, he started saying something about Shri Shibbanlal Saksena. Shri Shibban lal Saksena's charges were looked into and found to be totally baseless and communication to that effect was sent to me in writing by the then PM. It was made known to everybody including the press. I will however like to caution my friend hon. Vidya Charan Shukla that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones at others.

I know Shri Vidya Charan Shukla and his family luckily for me, for a very long time. Have they ever in the two generations of political life filed any case againist anybody for defamation for charging them for making money? And has any press expressed regret for what they talked about him? And I would say I am not........

SHRI VIDYA CHARAN SHUKLA: He raised a question. We did file a case of defamation on *Blitz*. They abjectly apologised to our family for framing false charges. That was published. You check, it, on 26th January, 1962, they published abject apology and withdrew all the remarks against me.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: 1962, agreed Sir. But is that all?

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: And he had to go in a court on one occasion and even when Shri Shibanlal Saksena's thing was printed by *Blitz* and we sent just a notice. *Blitz* not only apologised but printed an apology saying that all "all we have done was a wrong thing, and suggested to Shri Shibbanlal Saksena that "he too should apologised to Mr. Bahuguna." Not only this. It is already printed in *Blitz*. But I say, recently Mr. Vidya Charan Shukla was thrown out of Government by Hon. Prime Minister. I can say it is her prerogative. But remember one thing. Did not press gossip about corruption charges against Shri Shukla? Our hon'ble member was upset about the atrocities perpetrated on classes of people which brought her upto power. But don't the countrymen know her tactics in this regard?. She does not help those who help her. She does not help anyone who brings her to power. She does not help individually or collectively such people. In fact, when the comes to power, she demolished them because she believes in the Hitlerian dictum "You break the stairs which took you to the top" lest someone else also use it. Therefore, it is a long story from the syndicate to where we are now.

(*Interruptions*)

Therefore, it is a long story from Syndicate down to where we are. My dear friend Hon'ble Shri Vidya Charan Shukla, with all your great oratory of a personal vendetta against me you are not going to gain anything. I am emboldened to say one things. It is not my fault that Hon'ble Shri Charan Singh wrote some defamatory thing. My rebuttal is there. I am on record. With regard to this also Mr. Charan Singh had to express regrets and apologise in writing to me and Morarji Desai, the then Prime Minister is in the know of it as it is a document made public through press. One thing about Mr. Morarji Desai is that he will never speak untruth. He has also turned down Mr. Charan Singh's charge as absolutely wrong. Now I am making one statement. Now I am making one offer.

(*Interruptions*)

THE MINISTER OF TOURISM AND CIVIL AVIATION (SHRI A. P. SHARMA): He has denied it.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You never heard him.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: He denied Morarji's charges.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You did not hear him.

SHRI A. P. SHARMA: In view of the facts when Morarji brought the charges.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You did not hear him.

He said "I never made the charge on my own. It was Morarji Desai who suggested to me like this."

(*Interruptions*)

एक माननीय सदस्य : आपके बारे में पूरा सदन जानता है. . . . (व्यवधान)

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am making a simple offer. The Prime Minister keeps many files on many people. I am sure she had access...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I protest most vigorously. I have never had a file and I do not have any files now.

SHRI VIKRAM MAHAJAN: You must apologize and withdraw your words.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You came to know of her, Mr Mahajan, much later than I did. All I want to say is this. Let Mrs. Indira Gandhi, the Prime Minister of India, take any penal action against me on that particular allegation which was raked up by a person like Mr Vidya Charan Shukla shamelessly in this House.

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI C. M. STEPHEN): Did he make a no-confidence against you?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Yes; he made a no-confidence against me. Everybody was saying, 'Mr. Bahuguna, why are you thinking....' (*Interruptions*) He is not right, for, his numbers are never right; his telephone never works. And if we were to quote him — I have not quoted anybody to show what he had said about Mrs. Indira Gandhi at one time that after 1977 debacke if I quote Mr Stephen, all that he had said....(*Interruptions*) it would be very difficult for Shri Stephen..(*Interruptions*) I have not done it and I will not stoop to that level at all.

SHRI C. M. STEPHEN: You will stoop to the depth.

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: This is the man who said that she must be cut to her size.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I had had the privilege of staying with hon. Member Mr. Gadgil in his house..(*Interruptions*) in the great city of Pune. I thought he was a person...

MR SPEAKER: Please try to conclude.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You did not give me, earlier, more than 40 minutes. This time, let me do my job. You must allow me to do my job.

Hon. Member Mr. Gadgil started saying, 'Bahuguna has changed Parties'. A

[Shri H. N. Bahuguna]

kettle calling the pot black! Did you not change your Party? And what did you say on the eve of the defeat of Mrs. Indira Gandhi? My hon. friends on this side. I am addressing myself to the younger friends who had worked hard to bring back Mrs. Indira Gandhi to power —I agree with you when you feel hurt when somebody says something about her. But I am surprised about those who left her when she was down and out and are how proving to be more "loyal than the king". I am not a man who left her at any point of time when she was not in power. I parted company with her when she was at the height of her power. 1977, I will tell you why....

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: Not 1977, I am talking about 1980.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I will come to that. I will come to 1977 also.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I am not talking about 1977.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You never talk of the point which will rub you raw. But I am not proposing to leave you at that. 1977 goes back to 1974 and 1974 goes to Birla's attempted election to Rajya Sabha from Uttar Pradesh. It has not been an easy matter—our relationship. It is not one day's history. It goes to Jayaprakash Narayan; I spread the red carpet for him and I issued the Gazette notification in U.P. that he shall be treated as a guest of the Government while he was on tour of Uttar Pradesh. Our trouble goes back to the day when I refused to give my shoulder to the rising of the son; I am not a son-worshipper in any case; I will not do it. (*Interruptions*) The trouble came. (*Interruptions*)...in 1980 and the whole story is covered by the National Press specially my detailed interview appearing in *Illustrated Weekly* in February, 1980. (*Interruptions*) it is on record, not contradicted till todate on these and allied issues. One of the easiest arguments of Mrs. Indira Gandhi normally is that she does not read newspapers, she only gets printed in newspapers what she wishes people to read but she does not read them herself...

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: I have never said that.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: On the 7th September, I will remind...First of all I would like to correct my hon. friend, Mr H. K. L. Bhagat. Mr H. K. L. Bhagat says that I brought a lot of people in support of emergency. He is forgetting and he is mixing me up. On 12th of June the famous judgment of the Allahabad High Court came and on 20th June there was a rally here of Congressmen, people being brought-all from everywhere, just to say that Shrimati Indira Gandhi need not resign because there is still an appellate court available to her...(*Interruptions*) I will refer to that. I must say very frankly. If I was a guilty man for hiring in the DTC bus, hon'ble Shri H. K. L. Bhagat should have easily got me involved in that case and at least summon me as a witness...(*Interruptions*) I was never even summoned as a witness nor do I know how...(*Interruptions*) I am not yielding, Mr Bhagat. There is no question of this type of thing being said. Is it not a fact...

SHRI H. K. L. BHAGAT: Let him deny this. It is in the DTC records.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am denying it...(*Interruptions*) When emergency was imposed, I never came to Delhi with any of the people for any demonstration or anything like that. There is here a very elderly leader, Shri Kamlapati Tripathi and I am willing to abide by his inquiry. Let Mrs Gandhi give him the enquiry if she still has trust in him.

I am very clear in my mind as one of my habits is to keep receipts of all letters that I wrote to Mrs Gandhi. On 7th September 1975 I wrote to her, 'You have ridden a tiger, Madam. It is time to dismount or use the tiger will eat you up.' They say that I supported the emergency. I continued to tell her not to do it but she would not listen and ultimately she said, 'You must get out.' Why? When she could not get the party against me ... (*Interruptions*) Then she got Ministers, 10 Ministers nominated, of course, to my cabinet to say, 'We cannot work with this

man.' I easily told her 'I will go. I do not mind. I do not want to remain as Chief Minister' There was a reason. The day I went there as Chief Minister, it was at her bidding. Therefore, I thought that it was only moral to say that if she does not want me there, I must quit. But I had my overwhelming majority in the Congress Legislature Party of U.P. even on that day. It was not the question of majority or want of confidence that I had to quit as C. M.

A lot of things have been said by Mrs Gandhi and she had referred to Hitler and how Hitler was being praised by the people from the West. I have a lurking suspicion, Madam. I would like to warn Madam Prime Minister through you that perhaps people are praising her rather too much and I see some danger in that. People praising her disproportionately - danger lies there. It reminds me that perhaps they are trying to carve out a Hitler in her for they find the makings of a Hitler in Mrs. Gandhi...(*Interruptions*) They find the makings and they are sharpening them and you are getting sharpened and you say 'If I am a dictator, why should I hold elections?' I do not know why people go to Mr Anthony at all. I am surprised because he has advanced a poor argument. I will not engage him even if he comes free. He was saying this morning, 'If these Communists come to power, they will never hold elections.' He forgets the recent example. The Marxist Communist Party, the Left Front, in West Bengal won the elections and this Government was trying to avoid...(*Interruptions*) I am not yileding. ...

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: He is a deliberate Sir**....He is a deliberate**.. (*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: This is unparliamentary ...(*Interruptions*) You are using unparliamentary language, Mr Frank Anthony.

MR SPEAKER: Mr. Anthony, will you listen to me? You made an unparliamentary observation. (*Interruptions*) Will you please sit down? Mr Anthony does not listen to anybody. Why are you making an unparliamentary statement? Please withdraw it. The word 'used is unparliamentary. I have not allowed it. It is unparliamentary language. That is not allowed. I will expunge those words.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Why did you allow him when he deliberately** about it?

MR. SPEAKER: I have not allowed.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Why did you allow him, Mr. Speaker to defame me in my profession...(*Interruptions*)

MR. SPEAKER: I will expunge those words....(*Interruptions*)

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: You would not hear me? I withdraw. Let me please make my personal explanation. When he met me in Mrs Gandhi's house-in which year... (*Interruption*)

MR SPEAKER: I am not allowing your explanation. You may come later-not like this.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR (Ballia): Mr Speaker he must withdraw.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: He has wihtdrawn it.

SHRI CHANDRA SHEKHAR: Mr Speaker is** unparliamentary or not?

MR SPEAKER: He has withdrawn it. Now, please sit down.

SHRI FRANK ANTHONY: Please permit me to make my personal explanation.

MR SPEAKER: Please take your seat. I will expunge those words. I have not allowed anything. Please take your seat.

THE MINISTER OF STATE OF THE MINISTRY OF SUPPLY AND REHABILITATION (SHRI BUTA SINGH): The unparliamentary words used by him should be not on record.

**Expunged as ordered by the Chair.

MR SPEAKER: I will not allow until you sit down. Mr Anthony, please take your seat. Will you resume your seat?

(*Interruptions*)

MR SPEAKER: You do not go on record.

(*Interruptions*)**

MR. SPEAKER: Do not record.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am not going into anything, but look at the type of advocate and the arguments that party is getting advanced here. On behalf of that party, it was argued that the Communists would not allow elections...

MR SPEAKER: Will you kindly confine yourself to the debate?

MR. H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am confinding myself to the hon. Member's speech. Hon. Member, Shri Frank Anthony, said that if Communists come to power, they would never hold elections. I am asking, who held elections and who stopped elections. Let us see who was trying to stall elections and who was wanting elections. The tenure of Lok Sabha was extended by one year by Shrimati Indira Gandhi party by an amendment of the Constitution. Who are the people who in the recent past tried to stall the Bengal, Kerala, Himachal Pradesh, and Haryana elections? Who are the people who came in the way of Garhwal elections? A small bye-election! They say: "You are thinking too much of yourself." I am not. Hon. Jyoti Basu, Chief Minister, West Bengal, told the Prime Minister: "It is you, who have created this situation, otherwise we are not bothered about Shri Bahuguna." The Election Commission is on record about a finding against that side, for having looted and cheated the Garhwal Parliamentary poll in June 1981. It is they who asked for postponement of election again in November, 1981...(*Interruptions*). I have never wanted it. There is not a single communication from me asking for postponement even while I was hospitalised due to my leg injury. On the contrary, my communications are in demand to hold the by-election. My communication from the hospital is with the Election Commission. The hon. Law Minister can always get access to it.

One point was made out and they thought that it was a great point. They said that Shri Bahuguna resigned from Lok Sabha. But then what he asked. Some young man was employed to say this. He further said: "How about his friends? Why didn't they also resign?" Who is asking this questions? The people, whose whole power rests on defection. That was the first point of disagreement between me and the hon. Prime Minister. In Haryana, Himachal Pradesh and Karnataka, you came to power by defection. Here in this august House, Members elected opposed to your party now finding welcome place in your party after crossing floor your party takes pleasure in calling it Cong. (I)...(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: You very well know that this name was given by the Election Commission, not by us. It gave it of its own accord.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Agreed.. Now that the Election Commission has said that you are the Indian National Congress, why not give up this word Cong. (I)?...(*Interruptions*)

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: No, because there are so many Congress parties.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: You have got vested interest. The Prime Minister has developed a vested interest in the whole thing including the politics of this country. She has not nationalised, but she has, as they say, like a joint stock company, Made it a Joint Stock Company...(*Interruptions*). Why not my friends go by record...(*Interruptions*). When the present case is contrary to the case built Cong. (I) Member. They say that I told Shrimati Indira Gandhi to come to my house; it has appeared in the press a number of times...(*Interruptions*). She came on her own and not only this, she requested me to join her party and finaly (*Interruptions*). I was asked by the then Congress (I) President, and I have a list in writing

**Not recorded.

containing the names of the constituencies which she wanted me to visit. I visited 118 parliamentary constituencies including that of the hon. Member here from Delhi, Shri Tytler.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: I am willing to ask my friends to resign, provided they resign from every seat for which I had gone to convass or my friend Abdullah Bukhari had gone to canvass. Are they willing to do that? If they are willing to do that, I accept the challenge.

(*Interruptions*)

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Sir, there have been communal riots in this country and I had raised a question about this.

SHRI SANTOSH MOHAN DEV (Silchar): Including the West Bengal communal riots?

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: Yes, everywhere. She promised in a written communication to Mr Bukhari, the Shahi Imam of Jama Masjid that if a communal trouble takes place—it was written on a letter printed by Congress-I itself-that the officers will be held personally responsible. I had raised a question, there have been so many communal riots, but has a single officer been punished anywhere? No. Therefore, Sir, whether it is Scheduled Castes, whether it is all these people, the Government is not interested in saving their lives.

Then, Sir, the Hon. Member, Dr Subramaniam Swamy, has raised a question regarding the Prime Minister's statement that Arab money is flowing into Meenakshipuram for conversions. She has neither rebutted it, nor has she said a word about it. This is a calumny against the entire Muslim community in this country, which should not go unchallenged and it should be condemned by this House, because she is trying to make every Muslim as if he looks to foreign sources as if he is a purchaseable commodity. This is something which is dangerously bad for the unity of this country.

In the end, Sir, may I say that I am deeply disappointed by the degree of anger shown by the Prime Minister, but am equally happy that the target has been hit. I am hopeful that this House...

PROF. MADHU DANDAVATE: She could have been sweeter.

SHRI H. N. BAHUGUNA: She can if she wants to, but certainly sometimes it is dengerous because one of the authors on her has written a book-and Mr. Sathe may take note of it in which he notes that if she looks very happy and smiles, there is danger ahead of you.

In sum, Sir, I charge this Government for colluding wth monopolists, I charge this Government for serving the interests of the multi-nationals, I charge this Government for being anti-working class, for being anti-labour, for being anti-kisan for being anti-middle class, for being anti-Harijans and for that purpose the Government does not deserve to be there for a day. This majority may be there; you had much bigger majority all over the country on the eye of the 1977 elections, but your majority inside this House has become irrelevant compared with the people's aspirations and their anger.

With these words, Sir, I propose that the Motion moved by me be passed.

SHRIMATI INDIRA GANDHI: On a point of personal explanation. The Hon. Member has made a lot of misstatements. All his own history that he has described is without any foundation whatsoever.

21 hrs.

MR SPEAKER: The questions is:

"That this House expresses its want of confidence in the Council of Ministers."

The Lok Sabha divided:

[Division No. 14]

[21.04 hrs.]

AYES

Acharia, Shri Basudeb

Arya, Shri Kumbha Ram

Ashfaq Hussain, Shri
Azmi, Dr. A. U.
Bag, Shri Ajit
Bagri, Shri Mani Ram
Barman, Shri Palas
Basu, Shri Chitta
Bhattacharyya, Shri Sushil
Bhim Singh, Shri
Biswas, Shri Ajoy
Chakraborty, Shri Satyasadhan
Chandra Pal Singh, Shri
Chandra Shekhar, Shri
Chatterjee, Shri Somnath
Chaturbhuj, Shri
Chaudhuri, Shri Tridib
Choubey, Shri Narayan
Choudhury, Shri Saifuddin
Dandavate, Prof. Madhu
Dandavate, Shrimati Pramila
Das, Shri R. P.
Datta, Shri Amal
Deo, Shri V. Kishore Chandra S.
Digamber Singh, Shri
Gangwar, Shri Harish Kumar
Ghosh, Shri Niren
Ghosh Goswami, Shrimati Bibha
Giri, Shri Sudhir
Goyal, Shri Krishna Kumar
Gupta, Shri Indrajit
Hannan Mollah, Shri
Harikesh Bahadur, Shri
Hasda, Shri Matilal
Horo, Shri N. E.
Imbichibava, Shri E. K.
Indra Kumari, Shrimati
Jagal Singh, Shri
Jatiya, Shri Satyanarayan
Karunanithi, Shri Thazhai M.
Kashyap, Shri Jaipal Singh
Khan, Shri Ghayoor Ali
Khan, Shri Ghulam Mohammad
Khan, Shri Mahmood Hasan
Kodiyan, Shri P. K.
Lawrence, Shri M. M.
Madhukar, Shri Kamla Mishra
Mahata, Shri Chitta
Maitra, Shri Sunil
Mandal, Shri Sanat Kumar
Masudal Hossain, Shri Syed
Mehta, Prof. Ajit Kumar
Mirdha, Shri Nathu Ram
Misra, Shri Satyagopal
Modak, Shri Bijoy
Mohammed Ismail, Shri
Mukherjee, Shrimati Geeta
Mukherjee, Shri Samar
Multan Singh, Chaudhary
Nadar, Shri A. Neelalohithadasan
Negi, Shri T. S.
Nihal Singh, Shri
Pal, Prof. Rup Chand
Pandit, Dr. Vasant Kumar
Pranjpe, Shri Baburao
Paswan, Shri Ram Vilas
Pathak, Shri Ananda
Patil, Shri J. S.
Premi, Shri Mangal Ram
Rahi, Shri Ram Lai
Rai, Shri M. Ramanna
Rajan, Shri K. A.
Rajda, Shri Ratansinh
Rajesh, Kumar Singh, Shri
Rakesh, Shri R. N.
Ram Awadh, Shri
Ram Kinkar, Shri
Rasheed Masood, Shri
Riyan, Shri Baju Ban
Roy, Shri A. K.
Roy, Dr. Saradish
Roy, Pradhan, Shri Amar
Saha, Shri Ajit Kumar
Saha, Shri Gadadhar
Saini, Shri Manohar Lal
Saran, Shri Daulat Ram
Sarangi, Shri R. P.
Shakya, Shri Daya Ram
Shamanna, Shri T. R.

Shastri, Shri Ramavatar
Shejwalkar, Shri N. K.
Singh, Shri B. D.
Sinha, Shri Dharam Bir
Suraj Bhan, Shri
Surya Narayan Singh, Shri
Swamy, D, Subramaniam
Tirkey, Shri Pius
Trilok Chandra, Shri
Unnikrishnan, Shri K. P.
Vajayee, Shri Atal Bihari
Varma, Shri Ravindra
Verma, Shri Chandradeo Prasad
Verma, Shri Phool Chand
Verma, Shri R. L. P.
Verma, Shri Raghunath Singh
Verma, Shri Shiv Sharan
Yadav, Shri Chandrajit
Yadav, Shri Chhotey Singh
Yadav, Shri R. P.
Zainul Abedin, Shri

NOES

Abbasi, Shri Kazi Jalil
Abdul Samad, Shri
Ahmad, Shri Mohammad Asrar
Ahmed, Begum Abida
Ahmed, Shri Gulsher
Ahmed, Shri Kamaluddin
Ajit Pratap Singh, Shri
Alluri, Shri Subhash Chandra Bose
Amarinder Singh, Shri
Anand Singh, Shri
Anikineedu, Shri M.
Ankineedu Prasada Rao, Shri P.
Ansari, Shri Z. R.
Anthony, Shri Frank
Anuragi, Shri Godil Prasad
Anwar Ahmad, Shri
Appalanaidu, Shri S. R. A. S.
Arunachalam, Shri M.
Azad, Shri Bhagwat Jha
Azad, Shri Ghulam Nabi
Bagun Sumbrui, Shri
Bairwa, Shri Banwari Lal
Baitha, Shri D. L.
Bajpai, Dr. Rajendra Kumari
Baleshwar Ram, Shri
Banatwalla, Shri G. M.
Bansi Lal, Shri
Barot, Shri Maganbhai
Barrow, Shri A. E. T.
Barve, Shri J. C.
Behra, Shri Rasabehari
Bhagat, Shri B. R.
Bhagat, Shri H. K. L.
Bhagwan Dev, Acharya
Bhakta, Shri Manoranjan
Bhardwaj, Shri Parasram
Bhatia, Shri R. L.
Bheekhabhai, Shri
Bhoj, Dr. Krupasindhu
Bhoye, Shri Reshma Motiram
Bhuria, Shri Dileep Singh
Birbal, Shri
Boddepalli, Shri Rajagopala Rao
Brar, Shrimati Gurbinder Kaur
Brijendra Pal Singh, Shri
Buta Singh, Shri
Chandra Shekhar Singh, Shri
Chandrakar, Shri Chandu Lal
Chandrashekharappa, Shri T. V.
Charanjit Singh, Shri
Chaturvedi, Shrimati Vidyawati
Chaudhary, Shri Manphool Singh
Chaudhuri, Shri A. B. A. Ghani Khan
Chavan, Shri S. B.
Chavan, Shri Yeshwantrao
Chingwang Konyak, Shri
Chinnaswamy, Shri C.
Choudhari, Shri K. B.
Chouhan, Shri Fatehbhan Singh
Dabhi, Shri Ajitsinh
Daga, Shri Mool Chand
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Dalbir Singh, Shri
Damor, Shri Somjibhai
Das, Shri A. C.

Dennis, Shri N.
Dev, Shri Sontosh Mohan
Devarajan, Shri B.
Dhandapani, Shri C. T.
Dhote, Shri Jambuwant
Digvijay Sinh, Shri
Dogra, Shri G. L.
Doongar Singh, Shri
Dubey, Shri Bindeshwari
Dubey, Shri Ramnath
Ekka, Shri Christopher
Era Anbarasu, Shri
Faleiro, Shri Eduardo
Fernandes, Shri Oscar
Gadgil, Shri V. N.
Gadhavi, Shri Bheravadan K.
Gaikwad, Shri Udaysingrao
Gamit, Shri Chhitubhai
Gandhi, Shrimati Indira
Gandhi, Shri Rajiv
Garcha, Shri Devinder Singh
Gavit, Shri Manikrao Hodlya
Gehlot, Shri Ashok
Ghufran Azam, Shri
Gireraj Singh, Shri
Gohil, Shri G. B.
Gomango, Shri Giridhar
Gounder, Shri A. Senapathi
Gouzagin, Shri N.
Gowda, Shri D. M. Putte
Gowda, Shri H. N. Nanje
Hakam Singh, Shri
Hembrom, Shri Seth
Jadeja, Shri Daulatsinhji
Jaffer Sharief, Shri C. K.
Jaideep Singh, Shri
Jain, Shri Biku Ram
Jain, Shri Nihal Singh
Jain, Shri Virdhi Chander
Jamilur Rahman, Shri
Jena, Shri Chintamani
Jha, Shri Kamal Nath
Jitendra Prasad, Shri
Kailash Pati, Shrimati
Kamla Kumari, Kumari
Kandaswamy, Shri M.
Karma, Shri Laxman
Kaul, Shrimati Sheila
Kaushal, Shri Jagan Nath
Ken, Shri Lala Ram
Keyur Bhusan, Shri
Khan, Shri Arif Mohammad
Khan, Shri Malik M. M. A.
Khan, Shri Zulfiquar Ali
Kidwai, Shrimati Mohsina
Kosalram, Shri K. T.
Krishna, Shri S. M.
Krishna Pratap Singh, Shri
Krishnan, Shri G. Y.
Kshirsagar, Shrimati Kesharbai
Kuchan, Shri Gangadhar S.
Kunhambu. Shri K.
Kunwar Ram, Shri
Kurien, Prof. P. J.
Lakkappa, Shri K.
Lakshmanan, Shri G.
Laskar, Shri Nihar Ranjan
Madhuri Singh, Shrimati
Mahabir Prasad, Shri
Mahajan, Shri Vikram
Mahajan, Shri Y. S.
Mahala, Shri R. P.
Mahendra Prasad, Shri
Makwana, Shri Narsinh
Mallanna, Shri K.
Mallick, Shri Lakshman
Mallikarjun, Shri
Mallu, Shri Anantha Ramulu
Mane, Shri R. S.
Mani, Shri K. B. S.
Manni Lal, Shri
Mayathevar, Shri K.
Mishra, Shri Gargi Shankar
Mishra Shri Ram Nagina
Mishra Shri Uma Kant
Misra, Shri Harinatha

Misra, Shri Nityananda
Mohanty, Shri Brajamohan
Mohite, Shri Yashwantrao
Mohsin, Shri F. H.
More, Shri Ramkrishna
Motilal Singh, Shri
Mukhopadhyay, Shri Ananda Gopal
Murthy, Shri Kusuma Krishna
Murthy, Shri M. Rajashekhara
Murthy, Shri M. V. Chandrashekhara
Murugian, Shri S.
Muthu Kumaran, Shri R.
Muttemwar, Shri Vilas
Muzaffar Hussain, Shri Syed
Nagarathnam, Shri T.
Nagina Rai, Shri
Nahata, Shri B. R.
Naidu, Shri P. Rajagopal
Naikar, Shri D. K.
Nair, Shri B. K.
Nandi Yellaiah, Shri
Narayana, Shri K. S.
Nayak, Shri Mrutyunjaya
Nehru, Shri Arun Kumar
Netam, Shri Arvind
Nihalsinghwala, Shri G. S.
Nikhra, Shri Rameshwar
Pandey, Shri Krishna Chandra
Panigrahi, Shri Chintamani
Panika, Shri Ram Pyare
Parashar, Prof. Narain Chand
Pardhi, Shri Keshaorao
Parthasarathy, Shri P.
Patel, Shri Ahmed Mohammed
Patel, Shri Amrit
Patel, Shri C. D.
Patel, Shri Mohan Lal
Patel, Shri Shantubhai
Patel, Shri Uttambhai H.
Patil, Shri A. T.
Patil, Shri Balasaheb Vikhe
Patil, Shri Chandrabhan Athare
Patil, Shri Shankarrao
Patil, Shri Shivraj V.
Patil, Shri Uttamrao
Patil, Shri Veerendra
Patil, Shri Vijay N.
Patnaik, Shrimati Jayanti
Pattabhi Rama Rao, Shri S. B. P.
Pattuswamy, Shri D.
Pawar, Shri Balasaheb
Penchalaiah, Shri Pasala
Phulwariya, Shri Virda Ram
Pilot, Shri Rajesh
Poojary, Shri Janardhana
Potdukhe, Shri Shantaram
Prabhu, Shri R.
Pradhani, Shri K.
Prasan Kumar, Shri S. N.
Pullaiah, Shri Darur
Qazi Saleem, Shri
Quadri, Shri S. T.
Rahim, Shri A. A.
Rajamallu, Shri K.
Ram, Shri Ramswaroop
Ramamurthy, Shri K.
Rana Vir Singh, Shri
Ranga, Prof N. G.
Ranjit Singh, Shri
Rao, Shrimati B. Radhabai Ananda
Rao, Sri Jagannath
Rao, Shri M. Nageswara
Rao, Shri M. S. Sanjeevi
Rao, Shri M. Satyanarayan
Rao, Shri P. V. Narasimha
Rath, Shri Ram Chandra
Rathod, Shri Uttam
Raut, Shri Bhola
Ravani, Shri Navin
Rawat, Shri Harish
Reddi, Shri G. S.
Reddy, Shri G. Narsimha
Reddy, Shri K. Brahmananda
Reddy, Shri K. Vijaya Bhaskara
Reddy, Shri M. Ram Gopal
Reddy, Shri P. Bayapa

Reddy, Shri P. Venkata
Reddy, Shri T. Damodar
Roat, Shri Jai Narain
Rothuama, Dr. R.
Sahi, Shrimati Krishna
Sahu, Shri Narayan
Sait, Shri Ebrahim Sulaiman
Sajjan Kumar, Shri
Saminuddin, Shri
Sangma, Shri P. A.
Sathe, Shri Vasant
Satish Prasad Singh, Shri
Satya Deo Singh, Prof.
Sawant, Shri T. M.
Sayeed, Shri P. M.
Sebastian, Shri S. A. Dorai
Selvaraju, Shri N.
Sethi, Shri Arjun
Sethi, Shri P. C.
Shailani, Shri Chandra Pal
Shaktawat, Prof. Nirmala Kumari
Shakyawar, Shri Nathuram
Shankaranand, Shri B.
Shanmugam, Shri P.
Sharma, Shri Chiranji Lal
Sharma, Shri Kali Charan
Sharma, Shri Nand Kishore
Sharma, Shri Pratap Bhanu
Sharma, Dr. Shanker Dayal
Shastri, Shri Dharma Dass
Shastri Shri Hari Krishna
Shingda, Shri D. B.
Shiv Shankar, Shri P.
Shivendra Bahadur Singh, Shri
Shukla, Shri Vidya Charan
Sidnal, Shri S. B.
Singaravadivel, Shri S.
Singh, Dr. B. N.
Singh, Shri C. P. N.
Singh, Shri D. G.
Singh, Kumari Pushpa Devi
Singh Deo, Shri K. P.
Sinha, Shrimati Ramdulari
Solanki, Shri Babu Lal
Solanki, Shri Natvarsinh
Sonkar, Shri Kalpnath
Soren, Shri Hari Har
Soundarajan, Shri N.
Sparrow, Shri R. S.
Sreenivasa Prasad, Shri V.
Stephen, Shri C. M.
Subba, Shri P. M.
Sukhbuns Kaur, Shrimati
Sultanpuri, Shri Krishan Dutt
Sunder Singh, Shri
Suryawanshi, Shri Narsing
Swaminathan, Shri R. V.
Tandon, Shri Prabhunarayan
Tapeshwar Singh, Shri
Tariq Anwar, Shri
Tayeng, Shri Sobeng
Tayyab Hussain, Shri
Tewari, Shri Krishna Prakash
Thorat, Shri Bhausaheb
Thungon, Shi P. K.
Tiwari, Shri Narayan Datt
Tiwari, Shri Ramgopal
Tripathi, Shri Kamalapati
Tripathi, Shri R. N.
Tudu, Shri Manmohan
Tytler, Shri Jagdish
Uike, Shri Chhote Lal
Uraon, Shrimati Sumati
Vairale, Shri Madhusudan
Varma, Shri Jai Ram
Venkataraman, Shri R.
Venkatasubbaiah, Shri P.

Verma, Shri Deen Bandhu

Verma, Shrimati Usha

Vijayaraghavan, Shri V. S.

Virbhadra Singh, Shri

Vyas, Shri Girdhari Lal

Wagh, Dr. Pratap

Wasnik, Shri Balkrishna Ramchandra

Yadav, Shri R. N.

Yadav, Shri Ram Singh

Yadav, Shri Subhash Chandra

Yazdani, Dr. Golam

Yusuf, Shri Mohmed

Zainul Basher, Shri

MR. SPEAKER: Subject to correction the result* of the Division is:

Ayes—110;

Noes—337.

The motion was negatived.

MR. SPEAKER: The House stands adjourned *sine die*.

21.03 hrs.

Lok Sabha adjourned sine die.

*The following Members also recorded their votes.

AYES: Sarvashri A. K. Balan and H. N. Bahuguna;

NOES: Shri Kedar Pandey, Shri Ramaytn Rai, Shri Ramjibhai Mavani, Shri Ishwarbhai Khodabhai Chavda, Shri Vasantrao Patil and Shri M. S. K. Sathiyendran.

PLS. 40. XXXI. 25.82
890

© 1982 By Lok Sabha Secretariat

Published under Rules 379 and 382 of the Rules of Procedure and Conduct of Business in Lok Sabha (Sixth Edition) and printed by the General Manager, Government of India Press, Minto Road, New Delhi.